



THE ORIGINS OF THE SAFAWIDS

Shi'ism, Sufism and the Ghulat

Michel Mazzaoui

FREIBURGER ISLAMSTUDIEN · BAND III

THE ORIGINS OF THE SAFAWIDS

ŠI'ISM, SŪFISM, AND THE GULĀT

BY

MICHEL M. MAZZAOUI



FRANZ STEINER VERLAG GMBH · WIESBADEN

FREIBURGER ISLAMSTUDIEN

—
herausgegeben von
HANS ROBERT ROEMER

BAND III

THE ORIGINS OF THE ṢAFAWIDS

Ši'ism, Šūfism, and the Čulāt

BY

MICHEL M. MAZZAOUI



FRANZ STEINER VERLAG GMBH · WIESBADEN
1972



19741DMgIK84

32

Alle Rechte vorbehalten

Gedruckt mit Unterstützung des Department of Near Eastern Studies, Princeton University. Ohne ausdrückliche Genehmigung des Verlages ist es auch nicht gestattet, das Werk oder einzelne Teile daraus nachzudrucken oder auf photomechanischem Wege (Photokopie, Mikrokopie usw.) zu vervielfältigen.
© 1972 by Franz Steiner Verlag GmbH, Wiesbaden · Gesamtherstellung: Rheingold-Druckerei, Mainz

Printed in Germany

To *Ustād-i kāmil*
.....
M. B. D.

مَنْ عَلِمْتِي حَرْفًا كُنْتُ لَهُ عَبْدًا

PREFACE

The present study has been undertaken to satisfy the need for an examination of the religious situation in the central areas of the Muslim world following the Mongol conquest in the thirteenth century, and in part to explain and account for the rise of the Šī'i Ṣafawid state in Irān towards the close of the fifteenth. Only two major aspects of this immensely large subject have been dealt with here, namely *īqnā'ašārī Šī'ism* which became the established form of Islam in Irān ca. 1500, and the Šūfi order of Ardabil whose founder was the eponymous ancestor of the Ṣafawids.

The sources used in the preparation of this study – religious treatises, polemical compositions, hagiographical works, biographical material, and chronicles – contain a wealth of information whose significance and importance for the religious and social history of the post-Mongol Muslim world are immeasurable. A proper understanding of this history and a thorough evaluation of the religious problems involved are vital for a better appreciation of the social conditions in the Middle East during the later Middle Ages. For soon after the establishment of Šī'ism in Irān and the rise of the Ṣafawids, the entire Middle East extending from the Ottoman and Mamlük empires in the west and passing through the domains of the Ṣafawids, Uzbeks, and Mugāls in the east, became gradually involved in a struggle for survival with the rising national states of Europe – a struggle which led ultimately to the political weakening and final subjugation of the whole area by European powers.

There is much yet to be learned from a study of the backgrounds during the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. For this period constitutes the crucial link in the Muslim world between late medieval and early modern times. The aim of the present study, therefore, is to clarify and explain certain religious and social issues during this period, and to contribute to a more fundamental understanding of the complicated history of the Muslim world between the Mongols and the Ṣafawids.

Under its original title, *Šī'ism and the Rise of the Ṣafavids*, this work was submitted in August 1965 to the Faculty of the Department of Oriental Studies (now Department of Near Eastern Studies) of Princeton University, Princeton, N. J., USA, in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Oriental Studies. The thesis was successfully defended in February 1966. Xerox or microfilm copies of the original dissertation have been available from University Microfilms, Inc., University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan. For the present publication, the original work has been revised, corrected, and updated; the argument, however, has essentially remained unchanged.

This work owes much to the stimulating discussions which the author had over the years with his teacher and friend Martin B. Dickson of the Department of Near Eastern Studies at Princeton University. Other members of this Department, past and present, as well as professors and friends in Irān especially at Teheran University and elsewhere, contributed in various ways to the development in the author's mind of the thesis here presented. To all these persons I am deeply grateful.

I would also like to express a vote of thanks to the directors of the Fulbright Program for granting me a two-year fellowship to carry out research related to this general topic in Irān between 1967 and 1969. The Council on International and Regional Studies of Princeton Uni-

versity granted me a summer stipend in 1970 to prepare the final draft of the manuscript for the press. For this, too, I am thankful.

Most of all, however, it is to the members of the Department of Near Eastern Studies at Princeton and its Chairman, Professor L. C. Brown, that I owe the final decision to see the present work into print. A generous grant by this Department made this undertaking possible, and for this I would like to thank all my colleagues. For assistance of a highly technical nature over long, sometimes tedious, but always pleasant hours, my special thanks go to my two students and friends at Princeton, Fred Donner and Elizabeth Heilmann Donner, who helped me in the proof-reading and in the preparation of the indices, as well as in many suggestions along the way.

Finally, I would like to thank Professor Dr. Hans R. Roemer, Director of the Orientalisches Seminar der Universität Freiburg, for his continued interest in my work and for accepting it to be published in the *Freiburger Islamstudien* series.

Princeton University
Princeton, N.J., U.S.A.

Michel M. Mazzaoui

January 8, 1971

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER I: GENERAL SCOPE	1
CHAPTER II: HISTORICAL SETTING	7
1. The Ilkhanid period	8
2. The post-Ilkhanid successor states	9
3. Timur	9
4. The Kara-qoyunlus	10
5. The Aq-qoyunlus	11
6. Other centers of power	12
7. Trends and developments	13
8. Sources and authorities	15
CHAPTER III: SĪ'ISM UNDER THE MONGOLS	22
1. Naṣir ad-Dīn Ṭūsī	24
2. Ibn al-Muṭahhar, Ibn Taimiya, Ḫunḍī, and Śūstarī	27
3. Ibn Taimiya and the Nuṣairis	34
4. Nāṣir ad-Dīn al-Baīḍāwī	36
5. Conclusion	37
CHAPTER IV: THE SŪFI ORDER AT ARDABIL	41
1. Ardabil	43
2. Saīb Ṣaff ad-Dīn and the early Ṣafawids	46
3. From Firuz-sāh through Amin ad-Dīn Ġibrā'il: The Beginnings	51
4. From Saīb Ṣaff ad-Dīn to Saīb Ibrāhīm: The Sūfi Order	52
5. Folk-Islam in Anatolia	58
6. Sī'ism and the post-Mongol dynasties	63
A. Ibn Makki and the Sarbadārs	66
B. Ibn Fahd and the Mušā'ba's	67
7. From Saīb Ĝunaid to Sāh Ismā'il: The Ṣafawid Movement	71
CHAPTER V: GENERAL CONCLUSIONS	83
BIBLIOGRAPHY	86
INDICES	97
1. Proper Names, Persons, and Peoples	97
2. Place Names	99
3. Words, Titles, Things	100
4. Authors and Works	105

CHAPTER I

GENERAL SCOPE

When Šāh Ismā'il acceded to power in Tabriz in the year 907/1501¹ and issued his order that henceforward the call to prayer from the minaret should be "I profess that there is no God but Allāh, that Muḥammad is the prophet of Allāh, and that 'Ali is the *wāli* of Allāh,"² a celebrated Persian historian as he chronicled the event remarked that this call to prayer according to the rite of *iṣnā'aṣārī* *ṣī'īsm*³ had never been heard for five hundred and twenty-eight years in the lands of Islam⁴.

¹ The Hīgra year 907 begins on July 17, 1501. Rūmī's *Aḥsan al-tawārīḥ*, Gaffārī's *Tārīħ-i ḡāhān-ārā*, Qazwīnī's *Lubb al-tawārīħ*, and Iskandar Mūnī's *Tārīħ-i 'Ālam-ārā-yi 'Abbāsī*, all agree the *gūlūs* (accession) of Šāh Ismā'il took place in Tabriz immediately after the battle of Surūr which occurred early in the year 907/1501. Ḥwāndamīr's *Habib as-siyār* alone speaks of a *gūlūs* in 906: در روزی که داخل سنه ست و سهان: . . .

. . . بود (Habib as-siyār, IV, 467). See *Aḥsan al-tawārīħ*, II, 227, n. 3. On each of the chronicles listed here see now DICKSON, *Šāh Tahmāsb and the Uzbeks*, Appendix II, "Sources and Bibliography", pp. xlvi-lxiii. My attention to the correct dating of Šāh Ismā'il's accession has been drawn by Professor H. R. Roemer of Freiburg. Since then I have also received "notes" from both Mr. Roemer and Erika Glassen which I have incorporated in this work, and for which I would like to express my gratitude. For a definitive view on this point see now GLASSEN, *Die frühen Safawiden nach Qāti 'Aḥmad Qumī*, Freiburg i. Br., 1968, p. 85, n. 3.

² أَنْتَ أَنَّا إِنَّا إِنَّا وَالْمُحَمَّدُ أَنْ حَمَدًا رَسُولُ اللَّهِ [وَإِنَّ عَلَيْهِ . . . وَلَأَفْ] . . . حَمَى عَلَى الصَّلَاةِ . . . [سَبِيلٌ خَيْرٌ الْمُسْلِمِ]. (bracketed are *ṣī'i* "additions" to the *adān*). On this *ṣī'i* formula see Th. W. JUYNBOLL, "Adhān" in *E. I.*, first edition (article reproduced verbatim in *E. I.*, new edition), and Ča'far ibn al-Hasan al-Hillī (602-676/1205-1277), *Kitāb Sādī' al- Islām* (*GAL*, I, 514, and *Suppl.*, I, 711), translated by A. QUERRY: *Droit Musulman* . . . (Paris, 1871), I, 67; and by the same Hillī author, *al-Muhtāṣar an-nāfi' fi fiqh al-Imāmīya*, 2nd ed., Cairo, 1377/1957, p. 52 and footnotes on the same page, for the number of prescribed repetitions of the formula. As regards the *ṣī'i adān* JUYNBOLL observes, "These words have at all times been the shibboleth of the Shi'ites; when called out from the minarets in an orthodox country, the inhabitants knew the government had become Shi'ite".

³ Followers of the Twelve Imams on whom see D. M. DONALDSON, *The Shi'ite Religion: A History of Islam in Persia and Iraq*, London, Luzac, 1933 (which is now quite outdated), and Sams ad-Dīn Muḥammad ibn Tūlūn, *al-A'imma al-iṣnā'aṣārī*, ed. Ṣalāḥ ad-Dīn AL-MUNĀŪSĪ, Beirut, 1958 (which is rather brief). In this work, as indeed in all works on Muslim sects, the terms used indiscriminately for the *iṣnā'aṣārī* *ṣī'i*s shall be: *imāmīs*, *Ča'fariis*, *iṣnā'aṣāris*, and Twelvers. For an attempt by a modern leading *ṣī'i* scholar to differentiate between some of these terms and their connotations see Muhsin al-Amin, *A'yān as-Ṣī'a*, v. I, pt. 1, pp. 10-20, where the author discusses such terms as *as-Ṣī'a*, *al-imāmīya*, *al-Matāwila*, *Qizīlbağ*, *ar-rāfiḍa*, *al-Ča'fariya*, and *al-ḥāṣṣa*. It was never clear what each term exactly connoted. The following from Ibn al-Atīr (*al-Kāmil*, Cairo ed., 1303/1885, VIII, 42) on the death of at-Tabarī, the famous historian, who was accused of *raғīd*, is illuminating:

وَذُكْرُ وَفَاتَةِ عَمَدَ بْنِ جَرِيرِ الطَّبَرِيِّ (سَنَةُ ۲۰۱): وَدُفِنَ لِيَّا بَدَارَةً لِأَنَّ السَّامَةَ اجْتَمَعَتْ مِنْ دُفَنِهِ نَهَارًا وَادْعُوا عَلَيْهِ الرَّفِضَ ثُمَّ أَدْعُوا عَلَيْهِ الْإِلَهَادِ. وَكَانَ عَلَيْهِ بْنُ مَهِيَّ (vizer to al-Muqtadir, d. 320/932) يَقُولُ: «وَاقِعُ لَوْ سُنْنَ هَلَاهُ مِنْ مَنِ الرَّفِضَ وَالْإِلَهَادِ مَا مَرْفُوٌ وَلَا فَهْمُو»

See reference and translation of this in BROWNE, *LHP*, I, 360-61.

⁴ Hasan-i Rūmī, *Aḥsan al-tawārīħ*, I, 61:

هم در اوایل جلوس امر کرد که خطبای عالک خطبه ائمه ائمہ مشر ملیم صلوات الله علیهم السلام ائمہ اکبر خوانند و آنهاه آن علیه توپل الله و سی

The historian in question, Ḥasan-i Rūmlū, the author of *Aḥsan al-tawāriḥ*¹, refers to the historical incident when Tuğrul Bey of the Great Selḡūqs put an end in 452/1060 to the rebellion in Bağdād of the Turkish general Ḥasan al-Basāsīrī who staged a military coup against the 'Abbāsid caliph al-Qā'im, drove him out of Bağdād and declared his allegiance to the Fāṭimid al-Muṣṭanṣir². But the total of 528 years which Ḥasan-i Rūmlū gives cannot be reconciled to the date of this event. Further, during the period between al-Basāsīrī and Shāh Ismā'il, Shī'ī movements continued to exist in the Muslim world. The Shī'ī Fāṭimids persisted in Egypt until Shāh ad-Dīn the Ayyūbid sultān put an end to them more than a century after the Basāsīrī incident in 567/1171³. Moreover, successors to the Fāṭimid *da'wa* continued their activities in "the lands of Islam" until the arrival of the Mongols⁴. Their activity following the Mongol onslaught has yet to be investigated fully⁵.

However, the exact total number of years of Shī'ī inactivity is perhaps not the most important thing to determine. What is infinitely more important is the fact that when Shī'ism was established in Irān towards the end of the fifteenth century it was a novel thing – so novel in fact that our historian had to do some calculations in order to determine when he had heard or read about it last.

عل خیر الْتَّمَلِ، كَه از آمدن سلطان طغول بیک بن میکائیل بن سلجوق وفار نمودن بسایری که از آن تاریخ تا سنه مذکوره پانصد و بیست و هشت سال است از بلاد اسلام بر طرف شده بود با آذان فرم کرده بگویند.

FALSAFI in *Zandigāni-yi Shāh 'Abbās-i Awwal*, I, 167, quotes a similar statement from a MS. of Qāḍī Ahmad Gaffārī's *Tārīh-i ḡāhān-ārā*:

... مقرر شد که کلمة طیبه وآنند آن ملیاً ولی الله وسی عل خیر الْتَّمَلِ بتجویز علمای مذهب امامیه برخ سنیان بدگهر داخل آذان نمایند.

(FALSAFI, however, is wrong in ascribing the *Tārīh-i ḡāhān-ārā* to Mullā Abū Bakr Ṭīhrānī: ... منسوب به ... ملا ابر بک تهرانی نسخه خطی کتابخانه مل تهران *Tārīh-i ḡāhān-ārā*, was published, Tīhrān, 1343/March–April 1964. Ṭīhrānī's work, the *Tārīh-i Dīyārbahrīya*, written for Uzūn Ḥasan in 875/1470, was published by Faruk SÜMER of Ankara University and Necati Lugal in 2 volumes, Ankara, 1962–64. On Gaffārī see Storey, 116 and 1240; and on the *Tārīh-i Dīyārbahrīya* see 'Azzāwī, *Tārīh*, III, 5–6, MINOKSY, *Persia*, 16 and 18, and the introduction to Volume I of SÜMER's edition.

¹ Ḥasan-i Rūmlū was the grandson of Amīr Sultān Rūmlū, a high dignitary of the courts of Shāh Ismā'il and Shāh Tahmāsb; and his chronicle, *Aḥsan al-tawāriḥ*, was completed in 980/1572. See SEDDON, "Ḥasan-i Rūmlū's *Aḥsan al-Tawārikh*," JRAS (1927), 307–313; and DICKSON, *loc. cit.*, Appendix II, "Sources and Bibliography", xlvi.

² On the Basāsīrī incident see Ibn al-Āfir, *al-Kāmil*, (ed. C. J. TORNBURG, Brill, 1863), IX, 430–448; *Aḥsan al-tawāriḥ*, II, 227, n. 4; and M. CANARD, "al-Basāsīrī (Abū al-Hārith Arslān al-Muẓaffar)", in E. I., new edition.

³ PROCKELMANN, *History of the Islamic Peoples*, 225.

⁴ I. e., the destruction of Alamūt in 1256.

⁵ On the post-Mongol activity of the Assassins see for example, Ibn Baṭṭūṭa, *Rihla*, Beirut ed., 76 ff. (GIBB's translation, I, 106 ff.); BROWNE, *LHP*, III, 25 and 197; and IVANOW, "An Ismailitic work by Nasīr al-dīn al-Ṭūsī", JRAS (1931), 527–564, subsequently published in book form as *Taṣawwurāt* or *Rauḍat al-Isāmī*, (Leiden 1950), with text, translation, and a long valuable introduction in which he makes the following interesting observation quite relevant to the main theme of this work: "The rapid spread of Shī'ism after the Mongol invasion and the destruction of the political power of the Ismailis may perhaps be attributed to a large extent to the drifting of the persecuted Ismaili communities under the shelter of the kindred sect (i. e. the *Jīnd aṣāris*) which gained influence at that time." *Op. cit.*, 529, n. 1. 'Azzāwī in his *Tārīh*, Volume I, 153, goes further and states:

دونهم (إى اصحابية المرت) اشتفت مقاله غلة التصرف والمرورية والدروز والأفخانية والكتافية والبابية والبهائية في أربعة مختلفة وأشكال متعددة.

Hasan-i Rümlü no doubt knew his *šī'ī* history well; and in fact the apparent discrepancy in the number of years can plausibly be explained¹. For the political history of *šī'ism*, from the appearance of the first "political party" in Islam during the lifetime of the Prophet (*šī'at 'Alī*) to the establishment of *iqnā'ašarī šī'ism* in Irān under Shāh Ismā'il nine centuries later, constitutes one of the longest and most fascinating chapters in the history of Islam. Guided by their legitimist claims, the *šī'is* of Islam under a series of honest and at times opportunistic leaders continued the unending struggle to assert themselves and establish what to them was the legitimate state of affairs.

They had a long history of success and failure – more of the latter than the former. Muslim history is full of *šī'ī* adventurers who never could quite seize the all-important caliphate from the *sunni* leadership and establish their form of rule by *imāmate*. But the successes were memorable: the Zaidi state in Tabāristān; the 'Alid dynasties in Morocco and Yemen; the Ismā'ili state of the Fātimids in Egypt; the *šī'ī* leanings of the Buwaihids in Bağdād; the movement of Hasan-i Sabbāh and his followers – these are only a few of the successes². At one time, in fact, the eighth *šī'ī* imām, 'Ali ar-Riḍā, was appointed heir to the caliphate by the 'Abbāsid al-Ma'mūn in 201/816³. The struggle however continued until with the coming of the Mongols and the fall of Bağdād in 1258 the caliphate was no more, and all semblance of an organized struggle on the part of *šī'ism* ended.

But *šī'ism* in its various manifestations – *iqnā'ašarī* twelvers, *ismā'ili* seveners, and *gulāt* extremists – never really disappeared. The *iqnā'ašarīs* in fact made an early bid for power and influence as soon as the Mongol Ilhānid s established themselves in Irān; and under the effective leadership of the leading *iqnā'ašarī* scholar of the time, Ibn al-Muṭahhar al-Hilli, they actually succeeded in winning Sultān Ulğaitū Hudābanda to their views. For a decade or so early in the 8th/14th century Twelver *šī'ism* was the "official" religion of the Mongol lands. In the next generation, another leading *iqnā'ašarī* scholar, Muḥammad ibn Makkī al-'Āmilī, suffered a terrible end at the close of the fourteenth century on account of certain relations and correspondence he had with the Sarbadārs, a *šī'ī* post-Mongol successor state in eastern Irān. A third *iqnā'ašarī* scholar, Ibn Fahd al-Hilli, was active early in the fifteenth century during the Čalāyir-Qara-qoyunlu period when again he succeeded in winning over one of the Turkmān chiefs to *šī'ī* orthodoxy.

On the other hand, the *Ismā'ili* *šī'is* – under the new appellation of *fīdā'is* – became, long after the destruction of their fortresses, the fearful arm of the Mamlūks; and their activities, at one time at least, were the subject of one of the terms of a Mamlūk-Mongol peace treaty during the reign of the last Ilhānid Sultān Abū Sa'id⁴.

As for the extremist *gulāt*, the fifteenth century was their hey-day: from Anatolia to Māwarā'annahr their folk Islamic views permeated every *Šūfi* order and every popular *šī'ī* movement. The revolt of Saīd Badr ad-Din in Anatolia, the Sarbadār state in Ḫurāṣān, and the Muša'šā' dynasty in lower Iraq are only a few examples⁵.

Hasan-i Rümlü was satisfied with making the remark on the rise of the new *šī'ī* state in Irān and the mathematical calculation that went with it, and then he went on to elaborate

¹ E. G. BROWNE, *LHP*, IV, 53–54, attempts to calculate how Hasan-i Rümlü arrived at his 528 years by suggesting that the author was in fact making reference to his own times rather than to the *gulāts* of Shāh Ismā'il.

² For a list of the dynasties that claimed to be of 'Alid descent see B. LEWIS, "'Alids", in *EI*, new edition.

³ B. LEWIS, "'Alī al-Riḍā", in *EI*, new edition.

⁴ See below p. 39, note 8, on the Mamlūk-Mongol peace treaty referred to here.

⁵ These *šī'ī* activities here summarized will be dealt with in greater detail below. See also p. 62 ff., 66 ff., and 67 ff.

on Ṣafawid history itself. He did not stop to reflect on the question: why is it that after so many hundreds of years of dormant existence, *šī'ism* of the *iṣnā'aṣāri* persuasion appeared all of a sudden as a religion and as a state in the world of Islam?

Muslim historians of the traditional school of historiography do not as a rule answer the question why. They are by and large chroniclers of events, and Hasan-i Rūmlū is certainly not an exception¹.

However, there is no doubt that finding a cogent answer to this question is in itself an important undertaking. *Šī'ism* as a doctrine was always and throughout the entire span of Muslim history a highly controversial and burning issue². It is a major aspect of the general study of the whole of Muslim history. Moreover, nowadays, a large section of the Muslim world professes *šī'ism* as a religion. Irān is the leading *šī'i* state today; and it is sufficient to mention the large *šī'i* minority in Iraq. It is on the *šī'ism* of these two countries that the present investigation will largely be centered.

However, no definitive answer to this question is possible at this stage of the research and scholarship in the field. Work on *šī'ism* as a whole and on this period in particular is still incomplete and of a largely preliminary nature. Still, it is hoped that throughout this work and in the course of the discussion certain major points will be underscored, and that these may lead the reader to an understanding of the situation and serve as a tentative answer to the question posed. A concluding chapter will bring together these points in an attempt to clarify the project which will have been undertaken.

A major part of the project, therefore, is to try and find what exactly happened to *šī'ism* during the period before the rise of the Ṣafawids³. Work has been done on the early part of

¹ See for example what Philip K. HITTI says on this general problem: "Apart from the use of personal judgement in the choice of the series of authorities and in the arrangement of the data, the (Muslim) historian exercised very little power of analysis, criticism, comparison or inference." *History of the Arabs*, 6th edition, London 1956, p. 389. On this subject in general, however, see ROSENTHAL, *A History of Muslim Historiography*, Leiden 1952.

² It still is even today. See for example a recent work by Muḥammad 'Alī az-Zu'bī entitled *Lā Sunna wa-lā Šī'a* (Neither Sunna nor Šī'a), Beirut, February 1961. It is perhaps not surprising that the author appears to be a Zaidī – a *šī'i* school intermediate between the *imāmi* Twelvers and the orthodox sunnis. See his section on "Zaid al-ṣahīl", 229–230. During his visit to Persia in 1887–8, E. G. BROWNE observed that "the most burning political questions were those connected with the successors of the Prophet Muḥammad in the seventh century of our era." *LHP*, IV, 157. G. H. BOUSQUET tells of a *sunnī* teacher in Syria who had to change his name from 'Umar ibn 'Uṣmān to 'Alī ibn Muḥammad so as to be acceptable in a *šī'i* village to which he was appointed by the Ministry of Education. See Bousquet's "Études islamologiques d'Ignaz Goldziher" (Traductions Analytiques IV), *Arabica*, VIII (1961), 268, n. 1. The newspaper *Turkmeneskaya Iskra*, published in Ashkabad, capital of the Turkmen Republic of the USSR, has recently demanded "the suppression of what it called fanatic practices of the Shiah sect". See Theodore SHABAD in the *New York Times*, May 26, 1963.

³ *Šī'ism*, within the context of the present work, will be used in its wider and more general connotation as opposed to *sunnī* orthodoxy. However, three "types" of *šī'ism* will be differentiated as the discussion progresses, namely: (a) *iṣnā'aṣāri* *šī'ism* of the *imāmi* school, (b) *ismā'ili* *šī'ism* of the type that flourished in Egypt under the Fatimids, as well as the *ismā'ili* movement of Hasan-i Ṣabbāh, and (c) *ghulāt* *šī'ism* of extremist movements which flourished at the folk level of popular Islam. Zaidī *šī'ism* will not be discussed here. For a brief idea of what each type means see the following articles in the *Shorter Encyclopedia of Islam*: "Shī'a" (R. STROTHMANN), "Ithnā 'Asharīya" (Cl. HUART), "Ismā'iliya" (W. IVANOW), "Sab'Iya" (R. STROTHMANN), "Ghālib", and "al-Zaidīya" (R. STROTHMANN). For an intelligent discussion of the main aspects of the problem see S. MOSCATI, "Per una storia dell'antica Šī'a", *RSO*, 30 (1955), 252–267. See also E. LEWIS, "Some observations on the significance of heresy in the history of Islam", *Studia Islamica*, I (1953), 43–63, especially 54 ff. on "ghulūw"; and M. G. S. HODGSON, "How did the early Šī'a become sectarian?", *JAOS*, 75 (1955), 1–13, where he notes "the spiritual independence of the ghulāt" as one factor on how *šī'ism* escaped the fate of absorption in the *sunnī* synthesis.

Ṣī'i history, i. e., on the great Fātimid state of Egypt¹. Further, the Ṣī'i groups that carried on the Fātimid *da'wa* in Irān and Syria, namely the followers of Ḥasan-i Ṣabbāḥ, have also been adequately investigated². It is only after the fall of Alamūt to the Mongols in 1256 that we are left in the dark.

On this basis, the present work will limit itself to an investigation of Ṣī'iism during the two and a half centuries between the fall of the so-called Assassins and the victory of Ṣī'iism under the Ṣafawids in Irān³.

Geographically, as may already have been inferred, the present investigation will address itself primarily to Irān and Iraq. More specifically, the geographical areas which shall govern our attention throughout the discussion will be western Irān and northern Iraq. However, an area which as we shall see cannot be left out altogether from the discussion during this period is Anatolia – and in particular its eastern recesses. For throughout the two and a half centuries to be considered there were no political boundaries in the strict sense of the word between Irān, Iraq, and Anatolia; and it is only after the final establishment of the Ottoman and Ṣafawid empires that we may be permitted to speak of national and political, as well as for our purposes, religious boundaries.

In brief, the investigation shall attempt to cover the period between the rise of the Mongols in the heart of the Muslim countries and the rise of the Ṣafawids in Irān. For purposes which will become progressively more evident, the latter part of this period – i. e., the all-important fifteenth century – shall govern our attention most. Similarly, and in a geographic sense, the area to which we shall devote most of our time will be a triangle of territory with Tabriz, Qonya, and Bağdād forming its three geometrical apexes.

For "contemporary" views on Ṣī'iism and its divisions see the following:

- a) 'Ajud ad-Dīn al-Iḡī (d. 756/1355), *al-Mawḍiqī fī 'Ilm al-kalām*, Cairo, 1357, 414–430. Iḡī divides the Ṣī'a into Gūlāt, Zaidiya and Imāmīya, and lists the Ismā'īlīya among the 18 *gūldī* groups.
- b) al-Sayyid al-Šarīf al-Čurgānī (d. 816/1413), *Kitāb al-ta'rīfāt*, Leipzig 1845; see his definitions of *ismā'īlīya* (p. 27), *imāmīya* (p. 38), and Ṣī'a (p. 135).
- c) Ibn Haldūn (d. 846/1442), *al-Muqaddima*, Beirut ed., 1956, pp. 352–361.
- d) al-Qalqašandī (d. 821/1418), *Subh al-a'sā*, Cairo, 1918, Volume XIII, 222–253, section entitled "Ahl al-bida'". Qalqašandī divides the Ṣī'a into *zāidi*, *imāmī*, *ismā'īlī*, druze, and *nusairī*.
- e) al-Maqrīzī (d. 846/1442), *Kitāb al-Hīraf* (Dār al-'Irfān edition, Beirut, 1959, which incidentally is a very bad edition), III, 289 ff., or (the Cairo edition, 1326, a slightly better edition), IV, 162 ff. Maqrīzī dubs all non-sunnis as *gūldī*!

Most if not all of these writers give the traditional account on Ṣī'iism and the sects based on Šahrastānī, Bağdādī, Ibn Hazm, etc. No attempt is made by any of them to discuss the "contemporary" scene, hence their essential uselessness for our purposes, except perhaps for the fact that the traditional story persisted so long. This entire question deserves a special study.

¹ E. g., B. LEWIS, *The Origins of Isma'ilism: A study of the historical background of the Fātimid Caliphate*, (Cambridge, England 1940), which is originally the author's thesis for a Ph. D. degree at London University.

² Marshall G. S. HODGSON, *The Order of Assassins*, (The Hague, 1955); and more recently B. LEWIS *The Assassins: A Radical Sect in Islam*, (London, 1967).

³ One chronicle, the *Takmilat al-ākbar*, delimits this period further. The author speaks of the defeat of the 'Abbāsids, the coming of the Mongols and the Islamization of Čāzān Hān. Then he mentions the Ṣī'iism of Ulgātū Ḫudābanda, and

... و بعد ازو خود مدتها هرج و مرچ روی نمود تا قصبة صادقه جاه آلتخت و زهق آنبلال از حجاب تواری چهره گشود، رشاه جهان آرای فقطخ دایر آنفم الذین ظلموا و احتئفوا به رَبِّ الْمُتَّابِينَ در آینه ملک جلوه یعنی بعیقل شیرجهانگیری خاقان کبر ...

سلطان شاه اسماعیل ... زنگ ظلمت ظلم و غبار انکار از مرآت روزگار مرتفع و منقطع گشت.

See page 242a of the photostatic reproduction of sections of the MS. in EFENDIEV, *Obrassvaniye Azerbaydzhanskogo Gosudarstva Sefevidov v nachale XVI veka*, Baku, 1961.

Hasan-i Rümlü tells us further that when Šāh Ismā'il decided to establish *iqnā'ašari šī'ism* as the state religion in Irān he was at a loss to find a book which contained the principal tenets of the new religion. After some search a work on the *iqnā'ašarīya* was found in an obscure private library. This work was the *Qawā'id al-Islām* of al-Hasan ibn Yūsuf ibn al-Muṭahhar al-Hilli¹. We are told that this book was adopted as a basis for the newly established belief.

Ibn al-Muṭahhar was the leading *iqnā'ašari šī'i* scholar of the high Mongol period. His dates are 648–726/1250–1326; i. e. he lived at the beginning of the period of two and a half centuries which this work aims to investigate. Therefore, he shall conveniently serve as a good beginning for our period in the same way that his book served as the start of Šafawid *šī'ism*. And following a general section on the politico-historical setting for this period, the investigation proper will begin with a study of Ibn al-Muṭahhar and his times.

¹ Hasan-i Rümlü, *Aḥsan al-tavāriḥ*, I, 61:

در آن آوان مسایل مذهب حق جعفری و قواعد وقوابن ملت ائمه اثی مشری اطلاع نداشتند، زیرا که کتب فقه امامیه چیزی در میان بود، و جلد اول از کتاب «قواعد اسلام»، که از جمله تصانیف سلطان الملکاء المبشرین جمال الدین مطهر حلّ است که شریعت پناه قاضی نصر الله زیوری داشت از روی آن تعلیم و تعلم مسایل دینی مینمودند، تا آنکه روز آفتاب حقیقت مذهب ائمه عشی ارتقاء پذیرفت و اطراف راکناف عالم از اشراق لواح طریق تحقیق از مشارق منور گردید.

On Ibn al-Muṭahhar's *Qawā'id al-Islām* see below, p. 27 ff. (I have been unable so far to identify further Qādī Naṣr Allāh Zaitūnī mentioned here).

HISTORICAL SETTING

From the fall of Bagdād to the rise of the Ṣafawids is approximately two and a half centuries¹. To attempt to summarize comprehensively the general political history of this long period in a few pages will be a very difficult undertaking, particularly if one is to do justice to the various and almost innumerable states and dynasties that grew up, flourished, and finally declined in the area under consideration (i. e., Irān, Iraq, and Anatolia) during this period. However, to appreciate better and to understand more fully the religious problems of the times, a quick survey of the political history is quite indispensable. And so, instead of launching upon a detailed chronological narrative we shall highlight specific events and lay special stress on that part of the story which shall serve as a background to the subject of religious sectarianism during these 250 years.

And although the fall of the 'Abbāsid capital to Hulagu in 1258 is itself a momentous event in the history of Islam, the sacking and destruction of the Ḫi'i (Ismā'ili) stronghold at Alamūt two years before (in 1256) is for our purposes far more significant due to its religious consequences². Equally important is the victory of the Mamlūks over the Mongols at 'Ain Gālūt in 1262, inasmuch as this event sealed the fate of Egypt, Syria, and the Arabian Red Sea littoral, thus keeping these areas within the fold of strict religious (*sunnī*) orthodoxy under efficient Mamlūk domination³.

It is best to treat the history of this period, therefore, under five general headings, namely: the Mongol Ilhānid (roughly three-quarters of a century), the post-Mongol successor states

¹ In fact Shāh Ismā'īl conquered Bagdād in 914/1508, exactly 250 years after its conquest by Hulagu in 1258. – The main facts of the narrative here outlined are too well-known to require detailed documentation. Footnotes to this chapter, therefore, will be used very sparingly. A summary of the leading authorities and main secondary sources will form part of the discussion at the end of the chapter.

² See p. 40, note 2; and compare Barthold's evaluation of the cultural and economic leadership of Iran during the Mongol period in his *Ulugh-Bag* (v. II of *Four Studies on the History of Central Asia*, transl. by V. and T. MINORSKY, Leiden 1958), p. 4 ff.

³ Goldziher quotes Maqrīzī as saying: «رَأَخْتَ مُهْبَ الشِّيَعَةِ وَالسَّاعِدِيَّةِ وَالإِسْمَاعِيلِيَّةِ حَتَّىْ قَدَّمْنَا مِصْرَ كَلْهَا»; Ignace Goldziher (1850–1921), "Beiträge zur Literaturgeschichte der Sh'a und der sunnitischen Polemik", in *Sitzungsberichte der phil.-hist. Classe der Kais. Ak. d. Wiss., Wien*, LXXVII (1874), p. 457. But Maqrīzī (in *Sūlūh*, I, pt. 2, 440) has the following:

وَرَبِّهَا (أى سنة ٦٥٨ / ١٢٥٩ - ٦٠) ثَارَ جَمَاعَةٌ مِنْ السُّودَانِ وَالرَّكْبَادِيَّةِ وَالنَّلَّامَةِ وَشَقَّوْا الْقَاهِرَةَ وَمَمْ يَنَادُونَ بِالْأَكْلِ عَلَى . . .

The movement was cruelly suppressed. The Damascus historian Ibn Katīr (d. 795/1392) has the following story on the cruel suppression of a *rāfiḍī* in Damascus in the year 766/1364:

قتل الرافضي الحبيث: - وَنَفِي يَوْمُ الْحَمِيسِ سَابِعُ شَعْرَةِ (جَادِي الْأَعْدَةِ ١٢٦٤ / ٧٦٦) أَوْلَى النَّهَارِ وُجُدَّ رِبَيلَ بِالْجَامِعِ الْأَمْوَى اسْمَهُ مُحَمَّدُ بْنُ إِبرَاهِيمَ الشِّيرازِيُّ وَهُوَ يَسِّبُ الشِّيَعَةِ وَيَصْرَحُ بِلِمَتِّهِ، فَرَفِعَ إِلَى القَاضِي الْمَالِكِ قَاضِي الْقَضاَةِ جَالِ الدِّينِ الْمَسْلَاقِ، فَاسْتَأْتَاهُ عَنْ ذَلِكَ وَأَخْضَرَ الصَّرَابَ فَأَوْلَى ضَرَبةً قَالَ «لَا إِلَهَ إِلَّا اللَّهُ وَلَا إِلَهَ مِنْ دُوَلَّهُ». وَلَا ضَرَبَ الثَّانِيَةَ لِنَ أَبَا بَكْرٍ وَعَمِّهِ، فَالْتَّهِيَّةُ الْعَامَّةُ فَأَرْسَاهُ ضَرَبًا مِنْزَهًا بِحَيْثُ كَادَ يَكُوْكَكَ، فَجَعَلَ الْقَاضِي يَسِّبُهُ مَتَّمَّ يَسِّبَهُ وَلِمَنِ الْصَّاحِبَةِ وَقَالَ كَانُوا عَلَى ضَلَالٍ. فَعَنِتَ ذَلِكَ حَلَّ إِلَى نَالِبِ

(half a century), the period of Timūr (a quarter of a century), the Qara-qoyunlu Turkmāns (half a century), and the Aq-qoyunlus (the last half a century of our period)¹.

1. The Ilkhanid Period

To begin with, Irān and Iraq were subjected to Mongol rule, first from Tabriz then from the new capital of Sultāniya, under a series of Il-khāns who ruled with varying degrees of authority beginning with Hulagu Ḥān (d. 663/1265) and ending with Sultān Abū Sa'īd (d. 736/1335). Two of the chief representatives of the dynasty were Gāzān Ḥān (ruled from 694 to 703/1295 to 1304) and Ulḡaitū Ḥudābanda (ruled 703-716/1305-1316). Anatolia, where the rule of the Rūm Selġūqs was finally brought to an end formally in the early fourteenth century², soon became part of the Mongol domains. Governors were appointed to the various provinces in Irān, Iraq, and Anatolia, but, as was the case with the 'Abbāsid state, the farther the governor was from the center of authority the more free and independent he was in the dispatch of the affairs of his own province. This was particularly true of Anatolia.

The Mongol period of roughly three-quarters of a century provides us with two of our chief historical authorities whose works constitute the best informed background for the earlier part of the period under study. These are 'Atā Malik Ġuwainī (d. 682/1283), author of the *Tārīh-i ġahān-gušā*, being the famous history of the "world-conqueror" Čingiz-Ḥān, and Rašīd ad-Dīn Faḍl Allāh (put to death in 718/1318), author of the famous *Ḡāmi' at-tawāriḥ* and chief minister under both Gāzān-Ḥān and Ulḡaitū.

It was during the latter part of the Mongol period that Ottoman history in Anatolia began to take shape. Progressively and with ever-increasing vigor the petty states (*beyliks*)³, away from the central power of the Mongol Ḥāns, were asserting their independence and managing their own affairs. But although these principalities were slowly and gradually separating themselves from the main stream of affairs in the central Muslim world, we cannot discount them from our considerations for the entire duration of the period under study. For only under the Ottoman Sultān Mehmed II in the second half of the fifteenth century can we safely assume that that part of the Muslim world (i. e., Anatolia) actually became part of the Ottoman Empire. A large measure of instability (at the religious level) in fact continued to exist in Ana-

السلطة وشهد عليه قوله بأنهم كانوا على الفسالة. فعند ذلك حكم عليه القاضى باراقة دمه، فأخذ إلى ظاهر البلد فضررت عته وأحرقت العادة . . . وكان يئن يقراً بمدرسة أبي عمر، ثم ظهر عليه الرغب فجت الخبل أربعين يوماً فلم يفع ذلك، وما زال يصرخ في كل مروطن يأثر فيه بالحسب حتى كان يومه هذا أغلظ مذهبة في الجامع وكان سبب قتلـه وقتل بقتله في سنة خمس وخمسين.

See his *al-Bidāya wan-Nihāya*, (Cairo, 1358/1939), v. XIV, p. 310. However, these incidents in Cairo and Damascus appear to have been very sporadic, and no mass movement against the *sunnī* establishment is reported. Of a different type is the fate of the great *iṣnād aṣāfi'ī* scholar in Damascus, Muḥammad ibn Makki al-'Amili, "aṣ-Ṣāhid al-Awwāl". On him see below, p. 66 ff. Further, in the Mamlūk judiciary there was room only for the four chief *Qādīs* of the *sunnīs*. There was however a "Syndic of the Prophet's descendants" (نقيب الأشراف), with supervision over their genealogies and statistics, as well as their conduct, their claims on the treasury, and other special interests." See Popper, *Egypt and Syria under the Circassian Sultans, 1382-1468*, (Systematic notes to Ibn Taghribirdi's chronicles of Egypt), University of California Publications in Semitic Philology, Vol. XV, Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1955, p. 101.

¹ These time limitations are approximate and rather arbitrary; but they do mark the extent during which the party in question exercised general and more or less effective control.

² With the death of 'Alā' ad-Dīn Kaikubād III in 707-8/1307-8. The Mongol governors were stationed at Siwās in eastern Anatolia.

³ On the Turkish amirates in Anatolia see M. Tayyib GöKBILGIN, "Beylik" in E.I., new edition. See also Fr. Taeschner, *Ibid.*, s. v. "Anadolu", mainly section (iii), "Historical geography of Turkish Anatolia", pp. 465-68; and P. Wittek, *The Rise of the Ottoman Empire*, (Luzac, 1938).

tolia even after Mehmed II, and we shall have reason to refer to the hazardous religious situation under Bâyezid II in a later chapter. In fact, Ottoman rule in Anatolia became supreme and effective only after the victory of Sultân Selim over Sâh Ismâ'il at Çaldırân in 1514 and the subsequent Ottoman conquest of Syria and Egypt and the destruction of Mamlûk power in 1517.

2. *The Post-Ilhânid Successor States*

In Irân and Iraq, however, a semblance of Mongol power continued to exert itself under the successor dynasties of the Çubânids and the Galâyirs. The representatives of these two dynasties, however, could not at any one time claim power much beyond the capital cities of Bağdâd and Tabriz. The last effective ruler of the Galâyirs, Sultân Ahmad, after a turbulent rule of twenty-seven years, during which he could find refuge and safety at both the Ottoman and Mamlûk courts in his flight in the face of Timûr, finally found defeat and death at the hands of his fellow-traveler Qara-Yûsuf of the Qara-qoyunlu dynasty of the Turkmâns.

But there were other local dynasties and rulers during the half a century between the last Mongol Ilhânid Abû Sa'id and the arrival of Timûr on the Iranian scene. In Fârs the Ingû dynasty, and later the Al Muzaffar, were in local control; at Sabzawâr, the Sarbadâr dynasty established control; and then there were the Sulgûr Atâbekhs, the Atâbekhs of Luristân, the Atâbekhs of Yazd, and the Qarâ-hîtây of Kirmân. Finally at Herat the Kurt (or Kart) dynasty held temporary sway. The list is far from being complete¹.

All these dynasties, as has been stressed earlier, exercised authority and control in very small limited areas in the towns and their immediate vicinity; their several histories may, for our general purposes, be summed up in those of a city, a court, and a poet to extol the humble (to us) exploits of the different *amîrs* or *sûlâtâns*. There was no central authority in the whole of Irân during this period, and this was perhaps the most important single fact about this half century. But things changed almost overnight with the appearance of the new conqueror from the East.

3. *Timûr*

For in 1381 Timûr crossed into Irân and, until his death almost a quarter of a century later, the area underwent a tremendous though temporary change. The authority of a central power at Samarqand ran the affairs of the greater part of the Muslim world from the Syr Daryâ almost to the Aegean.

The settlement of the Middle East question by Timûr, however, had no lasting consequences in Irân, Iraq, and Anatolia². For as soon as he disappeared from the scene, the old familiar phenomenon of rule by fragmentation reappeared. For almost half a century after Timûr, i. e., during the reign of his son Sâh Ruh (ruled 807–850/1404–1447), the Timûrids continued to exercise some control over their western provinces, but this control was continuously slackening. Already the *beylikhs* of Anatolia, reinstated by Timûr after the battle of Ankara in 805/1402, had been rewon by central Ottoman authority, and Mehmed II was in his turn pressing eastwards. In Irân and Iraq, on the other hand, the fifteenth century was in effect a

¹ Good and fairly comprehensive summaries on each of these dynasties, including the Çubânids and Galâyirs, can be found in 'Abbâs Iqbâl, *Târib-i muâssal-i Irân*. Local contemporary chronicles on several of these dynasties or on the regions in which they held sway are progressively being published. See p. 16, n. 4 below.

² On Timûr's policy of conquest see a recent article by Jean Aubin, "Comment Tamerlan prenait les villes", *Studia Islamica*, XIX (1963), 83–122. The statement in the text above may perhaps be regarded as an outcome of that policy.

century of Turkmān domination under successive Turkmān tribal federations of the Qara-qoyunlu and the Aq-qoyunlu.

4. *The Qara-qoyunlus*

Following the death of Timūr and the weakening of the control of his immediate successors over the western provinces it seemed natural for the Turkmān tribes, left to shift for themselves, to get together in order to safeguard themselves better against absorption by their neighbors¹. The Ottoman Empire to their west was fast consolidating its possessions under a growing centralized system; while in the east, at Samarqand and Herat, the Timūrids were trying hard to keep their authority over these tribes.

Between the Timūrids in the east and the Ottomans in the west, two federations of Turkmān tribes slowly emerged in the no-man's land of western Irān, northern Iraq, and eastern Anatolia. One of these federations, the Qara-qoyunlu, established its headquarters in a roughly definable area north of Lake Van; while the other federation, the Aq-qoyunlu, began to operate from its center at Diyār-bakr. To the southwest were the Syrian frontiers of the Mamlük state – which is perhaps another factor in the formation of the two Turkmān federations.

Qara-Muhammad, the first important figure in Qara-qoyunlu history, was in effect a vassal amir of Sultān Ahmād Čalāyir to whose turbulent reign reference has just been made. Qara-Muhammad died in 792/1390, and the affairs of the federation fell to his son Qara-Yūsuf who, with Ahmād Čalāyir, made no effective opposition to Timūr, but instead fled upon his approach first to the lands of the Ottomans and later to Egypt. With the death of Timūr and the collapse of Timūrid power in the west, both Sultān Ahmād and Qara-Yūsuf returned to their former domains. Soon hostilities broke out between them and victory was on the side of the Qara-qoyunlu chief. In a battle near Tabriz Sultān Ahmād fought and died, and the Čalāyir possessions in Ādarbaīgān were inherited by the Qara-qoyunlus. This occurred early in the fifteenth century (in 813/1409 to be exact), and for half a century or more after this date the Qara-qoyunlu dynasty more or less dominated the history of the area.

The most important figure of the dynasty was Qara-Yūsuf's son, Čahān-Šāh, who was in more or less effective control after his father's death in 823/1420.

Čahān-Šāh for some time temporized with the Timūrids who at times, as we have said, could exert their power and influence in the west which was still nominally under their control. In fact, Šāh Ruh of the Timūrids supported Čahān-Šāh in his bid for power during the interminable succession struggles which almost everywhere in the area followed the death of a ruler and the accession of another. However, after establishing himself in Iraq and Ādarbaīgān, Čahān-Šāh began to push to the east and encroach upon strictly Timūrid territory. The inevitable struggle broke out in 863/1458 when a battle was fought between Čahān-Šāh and Abū Sa'id, the great grandson of Timūr and last effective ruler of the Timūrids at Herat. Abū Sa'id was defeated, and Čahān-Šāh in fact occupied the Timūrid capital for six months.

The power and authority of the other Turkmān federation, that of the Aq-qoyunlu at Diyār-bakr, was in the meantime growing, and their leaders were again enlarging their possessions eastwards. The two great federations finally clashed and Čahān-Šāh was defeated and slain in 872/1467 at the hands of the most famous representative of the Aq-qoyunlu dynasty, the great Uzūn Ḥasan. With the death of Čahān-Šāh, the affairs of the Qara-qoyunlu dynasty may be said to have effectively come to a close.

¹ On the political history of Irān between Timūr and the rise of the Šafawids see now R. M. Savory, "The Struggle for Supremacy in Persia after the Death of Timūr", in *Der Islam*, 40 (1964), No. 1, 35–65. The article is crammed with facts, and a few interpretative remarks would have been welcome. However, this is only "part of a doctoral thesis submitted to the University of London in 1958".

5. *The Aq-qoyunlus*

The history of the Aq-qoyunlu Turkmāns began when the first chief representative of the dynasty saw the benefits of attaching himself and his warriors to the cause of Timūr in his drive towards the west. The person in question was Qara-Osmān who fought against Qara-Yūsuf (of the Qara-qoyunlu dynasty), then moved westwards and defeated and killed Qādi Burhān ad-Din of Siwās in 800/1398, then joined Timūr in his clash with Bāyezid Yıldırım at the battle of Ankara and later in Syria. For his services Timūr awarded him the governorate of Diyār-bakr. From that center the Aq-qoyunlu began to expand in several directions but at first mainly at the expense of the weakening power of the Comnenae of Trapezund. Qara-Osmān died in 839/1435.

The most important figure of the Aq-qoyunlu dynasty was Uzūn Ḥasan, grandson of Qara-Osmān. Next to Mehmed II he was perhaps the most important figure of the century. He reigned over a large part of the area under study from 857/1453 to 882/1477–78.

Uzūn Ḥasan's involvements were fourfold: local, eastern, western, and international. On the local level he maintained cordial relations with the Byzantine dynasty at Trapezund: he married the princess Despina, daughter of the last representative of the Trapezuntine dynasty, Kalo-Joannes. His attempts to guard the interests of the dynasty led him finally to an armed clash with Mehmed II, the Ottoman emperor who had just conquered Constantinople and was rounding off his possessions to the east – a conflict which seemed quite inevitable. Uzūn Ḥasan's attempt to extend his frontiers to the north also brought him to incessant clashes with the Armenians and the Georgians in the region of the Caucasus. He made as many as five expeditions against the Čerkes. Also on the local level he assisted in accommodating members of the family of Šaih Šafi ad-Din of Ardabil – a fact which, as will be discussed in a subsequent chapter, was of paramount importance in the history of that family.

Eastwards, Uzūn Ḥasan was gradually encroaching upon the Timūrids and, as was the case with the Qara-qoyunlus before them, the Aq-qoyunlus soon clashed with the Timūrids in their push towards the east. Abū Sa'id, who had been defeated by Ğahān-Šāh of the Qara-qoyunlu dynasty, was now engaged in a war of survival with Uzūn Ḥasan. In 873/1468–69 he was utterly defeated and killed, and Uzūn Ḥasan's territory now extended from Ḫurāṣān and the Persian Gulf in the east to Ottoman territory in Anatolia in the west. For all intents and purposes, Irān appeared to have finally found a strong and able ruler. However, war with the Ottoman power in the west again seemed inevitable.

The reason for the outbreak of hostilities between Uzūn Ḥasan and the Ottoman emperor Mehmed II should best be sought in the attempts of the Venetian Republic and western Europe in general to contain the expanding Ottoman Empire. Constantinople had fallen a few years before, and the repercussions of its fall to the "infidels" was great in western Europe. Venetian envoys, well-placed in several sensitive spots in the Muslim world, advised their government that the rising star of Uzūn Ḥasan could be utilized to check the Ottomans. Uzūn Ḥasan was approached by the ambassadors of Venice, and their proposals seemed to tally with his own ambitions. Arms were dispatched by Venice to Cyprus where they awaited an opportune time to be delivered to the Aq-qoyunlu generals¹.

Everything appeared to be favorable for delivering a crushing blow to Ottoman power. All that was needed was concerted action among the "allies". This did not appear to have been

¹ The Russians under Ivan III in 1475 also sent envoys to Uzūn Ḥasan with the idea of allying with him against the Golden Horde. See Z. V. TOĞAN, *Umumi Türk tarihine giriş*, 356. (Togan's source for this is KARAMZIN, *Istoriya rossiyshago Gosudarstva*, VI, 59, 143). See also John WANSBROUGH, "A Mamlūk letter of 877/1473", in *BSOAS*, 24 (1961), 200–213, for complications between Venice and the Mamlūks on account of her relations with Uzūn Ḥasan.

effected: the arms sent to Cyprus remained there, and when Uzūn Ḥasan finally met Mehmed II on the battlefield, the might of the Turkish cannon won the day. The Ottoman victory occurred in 877-78/1473-74, and this marks the highest power of the Aq-qoyunlu Turkmāns. Uzūn Ḥasan died a few years later in 882/1477-78 and the affairs of the Aq-qoyunlu federation weakened. The attempt to contain Ottoman power was given up by the Venetians and they soon signed a peace treaty with Bāyezid II.

The remaining quarter of a century or so was marked by the usual disorders which follow the death of a strong ruler. The historical climate was suitable for the rise of the Ṣafawids¹.

6. Other Centers of Power

To give a more complete picture of the general historical events of this period, mention should be made of two or three minor centers of power in the area under consideration during this period:

- A. One of these has already been referred to, i. e., the Byzantine enclave in and around Trapezund on the Black Sea. With the fall of Constantinople to the Ottomans in 1453, the years of the kindred Comnenae dynasty at Trapezund appeared to be numbered. Entering into marriage relations with Turkmān chiefs in their environs was perhaps the last and weakest attempt on the part of the Trapezuntines to survive a doomed fate. Uzūn Ḥasan, doubtless under the influence of his wife, the Trapezantine princess Despina, tried to keep the Ottomans out of that enclave on the Black Sea. However, the efforts of Uzūn Ḥasan's mother to safeguard the interests of her daughter-in-law by pleading in person with Mehmed II had no effect on the Conqueror. When the Ottomans finally conquered Trapezund in 1461, all they were willing to give were some family heirlooms that were part of the inheritance of the beautiful princess.
- B. Minor reference has already been made to yet another and much more important center during this period, namely Ardabil in Ādarbaīgān. Ever since Mongol times, if not before, the family of Šaiḥ Ṣafi ad-Din was gradually establishing itself along an important and strategic center, and was slowly increasing its power through the activity of Šaiḥ Ṣafi and his descendants. More will be said shortly about the origin and early history of this powerful family whose descendants were able, towards the end of the fifteenth century, to establish themselves as the strongest single authority in all Irān. Suffice it to say here that the Šaiḥs of Ardabil, through their sagaciousness and the strength of their followers among the Turkmān tribes, were able to live through and in fact increase their power during Mongol, Timūrid, Qara-qoyunlu, and Aq-qoyunlu times, and emerge at the end of the fifteenth century as the strongest single power in the entire area. Their religious zeal and policy, their warlike activity against the Christian Georgians along the Caucasus frontiers, their marriage ties with the powerful Aq-qoyunlu dynasty, all these and other factors paved the way for their future hegemony.
- C. In the south near the Persian Gulf, and in an enclave centered around the small town of Ḫuwaizā, was another strong local dynasty, the Muša'šā's, who made a bid for local power during this period. Utilizing the weakness of their neighbours in Bagdād and their remoteness from the other center of authority in Tabriz, the Muša'šā's were able to establish themselves as a relatively strong power in the marshy lands of southern Iraq for a fairly long period. Their independent existence continued until the rise of the Ṣafawids and needed a special campaign by Šāh Ismā'il himself. Under the Ṣafawids they continued

¹ The details of this section of the narrative will be dealt with at some length in a succeeding chapter. See p. 79 ff.

to be an important family of governors, and in fact, the family, or a related branch of it, remained influential in that region until near recent times when Rizā Šāh Pahlavi was able in 1924 to put an end to the independent behavior of Šaih Ḥaz'al in the oil rich province of Ḫūzistān.

D. Finally, a word should be said about another Turkmān dynasty which was located in an unfavorable position between the possessions of the three strong powers: the Ottomans, the Mamlūks, and the Qara-qoyunlus and Aq-qoyunlus. This was the Dū l-Qadr state at Elbistān¹ in and around Mar'aš on the highlands commanding the plain of Adana, in the southeast corner of Anatolia. Dū l-Qadr territory was ambitiously eyed by the three powers around it, but the dynasty was able to preserve its shaky independence until early in the sixteenth century when Sultān Selim finally annexed it to the Ottoman Empire in preparation for his drive eastward against the Ṣafawids and southward against the Mamlūks.

7. Trends and Developments

Having thus far outlined briefly the main historical events of these two and a half centuries, it remains for us now by way of conclusion to discuss some problems and point out certain trends which were developing and taking form throughout this period:

i) One of these is the important observation that progressively during this period Arab ascendancy in the context of the 'Abbāsid caliphate was gradually giving way to a Perso-Turkish culture that was fast replacing it. This trend actually began long before the Mongols destroyed the 'Abbāsid caliphate when they occupied Baġdād in 1258. (This is partly why the fall of Baġdād was not such a crucial event after all). In fact this trend could be traced back to the time when 'Abbāsid caliphs of the ninth century A. D accepted Turkish soldiers in their bodyguards, and when independent Persian dynasties rose in the east in the tenth and eleventh centuries. Actually, the Selḡūq period in Baġdād during the 11th-12th century had more or less effectively put an end to independent Arab hegemony in the caliphate. But the fall of Baġdād was in reality a crowning blow to any further attempts to reestablish Arab power – attempts made by such strong caliphs as an-Nāṣir (575-622/1180-1225) in the thirteenth century. Arabic as a language, however, continued to enjoy a special position among writers and learned men. This was particularly true in Ṣī'i writings and in certain Ṣūfī works. But side by side with it, Persian was slowly gaining ascendancy, and soon Turkish too was developing into a court and army language.

This trend could be felt throughout the entire area, and it was growing stronger from dynasty to dynasty and from district to district, so that at the end of our period, i. e., around the year 1500, the Muslim world was partitioned among four strong powers of Perso-Turkish culture: the Ottomans in the west, then the Ṣafawids in Irān, then the Uzbeks in Māwarā'annahr, and finally the Moğuls in India. The Arab lands of Syria and Egypt became early in the sixteenth century a minor appanage of the Ottoman Empire. This arrangement remained more or less static – naturally with recurring border clashes along the frontiers – until the eighteenth century and the arrival of the imperialistic West.

ii) Another problem during these 250 years – a problem more fore the present day scholar than for the people living at that time – was that of the boundaries themselves, mainly those to the east in Ḥurāsān, and those in the west in Āgarbaīgān und Iraq. Attempts have been

¹ See TAESCHNER, "Elbistan", in *E.I.*, new edition; and J. H. MORDTMANN, "Dhu 'l-Kadr", also in *E.I.*, new edition (article revised by V. L. MÉNAGE). Short sections on the Dū l-Qadr dynasty can be found in most contemporary chronicles.

made to map these boundaries particularly in that undefined area where the Mamlük, Ottoman, and Turkmān frontiers met along the upper Euphrates¹. For lack of definite lines, the age-old frontier along the upper valley of the Euphrates may be taken as a roughly convenient boundary line which marked the farthest extent of Mamlük territory to the northeast². This border was very well guarded against attack by armies and, more important for our purposes, against the passage of ideas. However, the boundaries between Irān and Anatolia can at no time be definitively drawn during this period. This in itself was a very significant phenomenon for this area throughout the entire period. It was somewhere along this frontier that the Turkmān dynasties grew up, flourished, and rose to power. This is the location of Diyār-bakr and Lake Van, the original homes of the Aq-qoyunlu and Qara-qoyunlu dynasties. Further to the west were Qaramān, Germiān, and the other Turkish *beyliks* extending all the way to the emirate of Osmān in the northwest of Anatolia. Here too lay the state of Dū l-Qadr, and to the northeast of this area lay the possessions of the ephemeral empire of Trapezund.

Movements of tribes and peoples, *sufī ṣaḥīḥ*s and their followers, Muslim *'ulamā* and government officials, were continuous along the undetermined frontiers of this area. This was perhaps the most important single factor which helped in the dissemination of the religious ideas which shall concern us in later chapters. One can see in this situation an open society of free movement and intercourse. At the end of the 250 years, with the *sunnī* Ottomans on one side and the *šī'ī* Ṣafawids on the other, the curtain falls.

iii) Another important problem to which a passing reference has already been made in dealing with Uzūn Hasan and the Aq-qoyunlus, was the international involvements of many of the ruling houses during this period. For one thing, the Crusades which began at the end of the eleventh century were not finally eliminated until 1291 when their last stronghold at Acre fell to the Mamlüks. However, this did in no way end European interests in the Middle East, for this was the period of the increased commercial activity between the Italian cities of Venice and Genoa, to mention only two, and the Mediterranean and Black Sea coasts. The hinterlands of Syria, Iraq, and Irān were still the main routes of eastern trade.

In addition to commercial activity, the rising power of the Ottomans was posing a serious threat to eastern Europe; and the West, throughout the entire period, was looking for allies to counter this threat. The Mongol period in Irān was an era of tremendous diplomatic activity during the last few decades of the life of Outremer in a desperate attempt to relieve the pressure against the few remaining Crusade garrisons facing the growing power of the Mamlüks in Syria. And later, the Turkmāns (chiefly during the period of Uzūn Hasan as we have seen) were approached to meet the common danger of the Ottomans³.

Why these attempts failed does not concern us here. Long distances, half-hearted assistance, and an almost complete difference in outlook (based on contrasting ambitions between the

¹ Witness for example, POPPER, *Egypt and Syria under the Circassian Sultans*, pp. 11, 16, and 41, and maps nos. 2 and 18, in his attempts to delineate the northeast Mamlük frontier. He pins down the frontier line as follows: North – From a point a little NW of Dawriki (Dauraki, Devrigi, Dawraki, or Divrigi – all five spellings are given!) – 220 miles north of Aleppo) southwest 350 miles to a point on the Mediterranean SW of Tarsus; East – from a point on the Euphrates E of Rahba, then NW 350 miles to a point NE of Dawriki. See also the attempts at map-making at the end of Walther Hinz, *Irans Aufstieg*.

² Abū l-Fidā (d. 732/1343) relates one instance where an Arab border amir, Muhammā ibn 'Isā, had an *iqāṣ* from the Mamlüks near Aleppo, and at the same time another, in Hillā, from the Mongols (Ulğaitū). The historian adds: . . . اَسْرَى مَلِكَةً وَلَا جَرِي نَظِيرٍ . . . See his *Kitāb al-muḥtaṣar fi aḥbār al-baṣar*, IV, 71. Apparently the domains of this feudal family were fertile grounds to hatch invasion plans across the Mongol-Mamlük border. See Ibn al-Fūlī, *al-Hawādīf al-ḡāmi'a*, 412.

³ For a summary of East-West relations during Mongol, Turkmān, and Ṣafawid times see V. Minorsky, "The Middle East in western Politics in the 13th, 15th, and 17th Centuries", *JRCA.S*, XXVII (1940), No. 4, 427–461.

western traders and missionaries and the oriental dynasts) seem to indicate that all such rapprochement was doomed to failure from the start.

In any case, this international activity, both commercial and political, continued throughout the whole period, and ceased only, almost overnight, when the entire usefulness of the Middle East was questioned upon the discovery of the all-sea route to the Far East in 1496 almost at the close of our period. This was perhaps one of the most important out-flanking movements in modern times as far as the continued importance and prosperity of the area is concerned¹. Its consequences were far-reaching, and they contributed considerably to the success of the experiment begun in Iran by Shah Isma'il and the Safawids. For although the Ottoman Sultan Selim delivered a crushing blow to the newly founded Safavid state at the battle of Çaldırān in 1514 and could perhaps have put an end to the newly established Shi'i state, still he found he had to turn back to Syria and Egypt in a desperate attempt to get to the Red Sea and the Indian Ocean as a countermove to check the growing Portuguese expansion in that area. A similar move on his part was to expand Ottoman power along the North African coastline where he recognized the achievements of the Barbary corsairs in their struggle with the Spanish pirates. Were the Ottomans trying to get to the Atlantic Ocean?²

8. Sources and Authorities

But we must leave our historical narrative at this point, and, before we conclude, we should say a few words about the historical sources for this period:

The last of the great Arab historians, 'Izz ad-Din ibn al-Atīr, had passed away from the scene as the Mongol hordes were passing north of his native town of Mosul in their drive northwestward. His *al-Kāmil fī t-Tārīħ* although it does not deal at all with our period, is still the best available source for the background of the Mongol invasion³. For the Mongol period proper we are fortunate in possessing the works of two of the most famous Muslim historians who wrote in Persian, namely Atā Malik Ḥuwainī⁴ and Rašīd ad-Dīn Faḍl Allāh⁵. The histo-

¹ For a dramatic analysis of this phenomenon see Arnold TOYNBEE, *Civilization on Trial*, (New York, Meridian Books, 1958), Chapter 5, "The unification of the world and the change in historical perspective", pp. 63–92. No doubt it was this international cataclysm which prompted Mr. Toynbee to add an Annex to his first volume of *A Study of History*, pp. 347–402, where he attempts at some length to analyse the significance of the rise of Shi'ism in Iran under Shah Isma'il ca. 1500.

² In an unpublished graduate seminar paper (Princeton University 1960–61), I tried to argue, along these lines, the significance of Sultan Selim's conquest of Syria, Egypt, and the Hijāz on the one hand, and his push into North Africa by giving support and recognition to the Barbary corsairs on the other.

³ *al-Kāmil* ends with the year 629/1231. Ibn al-Atīr's last entries describe the occupation of Aḍarbāiğān by the Tatars (read Mongols). He quotes from a letter that came into his hands, sent by a merchant in Rayy, who had accompanied the Mongols to Aḍarbāiğān, to his friends (business associates?) in Mosul:

وَإِنَّ الْكَافِرَ لَهُ أَقْدَرُ نَصْفَهُ وَلَا كُثْرَةُ جُمُودِهِ حَتَّى لا تَنْقُلُونَ قُلُوبَ الْمُسْلِمِينَ فَانَّ الْأَمْرَ عَظِيمٌ . . .

– v. XII (al-Azhar ed.), p. 234. Some may object to calling Ibn al-Atīr "the last of the great Arab historians", and would prefer to reserve this honor to Ibn Haldūn or to later historians. This may be so; but it is felt that the latter's famous *Muqaddima* – being the first book of his universal history – has minimized his importance as a historian while enhancing his position as a great social scientist. For further reference to Arab historians after Ibn al-Atīr consult the following three short bio-bibliographical works: al-'Azzāwī, *at-Ta'rif bil-mu'arriħīn*, v. 1 on the Mongol-Turkman period, 601–941/1204–1534, (Baghdād, 1376/1957); M. M. Ziyādā, *al-Mu'arriħūn fi l-Qarn al-hāmis-aśār*, (Cairo, 1954); and Ṣalāḥ ad-Dīn al-Munāggid, *al-Mu'arriħūn al-Dimashqīyūn wa-āfāruhūm al-mahjūfa*, (Cairo, 1956).

⁴ Ḥuwainī's *Tārīħ-i ǵahān-gus̄ā*, i. e. the history of the world conqueror Čingiz-hān, was completed in 658/1260. The third section of the work deals with Hasan-i Ṣabbāh and the Ismā'īlīs of Alamūt. Atā Malik was governor of Baġdād for a long time following the Mongol conquest. His brother Muḥammad was the Ṣāhib Dīvān, perhaps the highest civilian post in the Mongol administration.

⁵ Rašīd ad-Dīn was chief minister to both Gāzān-hān and Ulġaitū, and was perhaps the most influential

rical and geographical works of Ḥamd Allāh Mustaufī-yi Qazwīnī¹ complement the material of the other two more celebrated historians².

On the post-Mongol pre-Timūrid period (that of the Čalāyirs and other local dynasties) we possess no work of comparable magnitude³. Information about this turbulent period, however, can be gleaned from later chronicles and from city and town histories which were common at this time⁴, as well as from the literature produced at the various courts, much of which is of important topical significance⁵.

The career and campaigns of Timūr, on the other hand, have been chronicled by two famous historians: the one in Persian – the *Zafarnāma* of Ṣaraf ad-Dīn 'Alī Yazdī⁶; the other in Arabic – Ibn 'Arabshāh's '*Ağā'ib al-maqdūr*⁷; the former a work of a panegyrist, the latter a highly

personage during the high Ilhānid period. His history, the *Gāmi' al-tawārīḥ*, is still not published in its entirety. Still useful is E. G. BROWNE's analysis of the contents of this world history in *JRAS* (January 1908), 17–37. See also Z. V. TOGAN, "The composition of the History of the Mongols by Rashid al-Dīn", in *Central Asian Journal*, VII, 1 (March 1962), 60–72; and Manūčehr MURTAZĀWĪ's comprehensive remarks on *Gāmi' al-tawārīḥ* in his *Tahqīq . . .* p. 158 ff. (In this last reference see the discussion on a work on Sultān Ulġaitū called *Tārīħ-i Ulgānitā*, by Abū al-Qāsim 'Abd Allāh ibn 'Alī al-Kāshānī, p. 205 ff., and Cf. STOREY, 267 and 1272). On Rašīd ad-Dīn's *Muhibbat al-awālī*, see below p. 18, note 7.

¹ Qazwīnī's *Tārīħ-i gusīda* was completed in 730/1330, and his geographical work, the *Nuzhat al-Qulūb*, a few years later. As *mustaufī* or tax collector, Qazwīnī is very authoritative and trustworthy. To him we owe one of the earliest factual references to Shāh Šāfi ad-Dīn of Ardabīl. See below p. 46, note 3.

² For a very good descriptive list of the major historical works (published or in MS. form) of the Mongol Ilhānid period see Manūčehr MURTAZĀWĪ, *Tahqīq . . .* section entitled: «کتاب‌های تاریخی که در دوره ایلخانان تألیف شده‌اند» pp. 137–57. MURTAZĀWĪ lists as many as 33 major works.

³ See, however, Abū Bakr al-Qutbī al-Ahārī, *Tārīħ-i Shaikh Uwais*, . . . ed. and translated (only pages 134–184 of the manuscript) by J. B. VAN LOON, The Hague, 1954.

⁴ On histories of cities and towns and of local dynasties: Of particular importance are the four volumes published by B. DORN under the general title: *Mohammedanische Quellen zur Geschichte der südlichen Küstenländer des Kaspischen Meeres*, (St. Petersburg, 1857–58). They include the *Tārīħ-i Hāni* on Gilān, 880–920/1475–1514, by 'Alī ibn Sāms ad-Dīn ibn Hāggī Husain; the *Tārīħ-i Gilān* in 923–1038/1517–1628 of 'Abd al-Fattāḥ Fūmanī; and the *Tārīħ-i Tabāristān wa-Rūyān wa-Māzandarān* of Zāhir ad-Dīn ibn Naṣr al-Dīn al-Mar'ašī (815–892/1412–1486). Volume IV includes an important selection, (pp. 468–472), from Ğannābī's *Tuhfat al-adīb*. (Ğannābī's other work: *al-'Aīlam az-zāhir fi aħwāl al-awālī w-al-audħir*, known as *Tārīħ al-Ğannābī*, was summarized by Qaramānī in *Aħħabar ad-duwal*. See 'Azzāwī, *Tārīħ*, II, 23–24 and III, 12–13, and *GAL*, II, 387–88, and Suppl. 2, 412). This volume deals mainly with Tabāristān and Gilān, and includes selections from Yāqūt, Ma'sūdī, Mustaufī-yi Qazwīnī (*Nuzhat al-qulūb*), Rāzī (*Hajj iqilm*), Samarqandī (*Mafla' as-Sa'dain*), Iskandar Munīšī (*Tārīħ-i 'Ālam-ārā-yi 'Abbāsī*), Hasan-i Rūmī, Ḫwāndamlīr, Ḫażiż-i Abrū (*Zubdat al-tawārīħ*), and others. For a partial list of some of these local histories see STOREY, I, pp. 348–366, where the histories are listed for Qum, Iṣfahān, Kāshān, Fārs, Ḫurāsān, Kirmān, Tabāristān, Gilān, Sīstān, and Ḫuzistān. See also:

احمد علی خان وزیری کرمان، تاریخ کرمان، تهران ۱۳۶۱/۱۴۴۰ - ظهیر الدین بن نصیر الدین مرعشی، تاریخ گیلان و دیلمستان، رشت ۱۳۲۰ - ظهیر الدین بن نصیر الدین مرعشی، تاریخ طبرستان و رویان و مازندران، تهران، ۱۳۲۲ (a new edition of محمد کتبی (fl. 1420)، تاریخ آمل مظفر، تهران ۱۳۲۰/۱۴۰۶ - عبد الرحیم کلانتر ضرابی (the same work by DORN, above). سهیل کاشان)، تاریخ کاشان، تهران ۱۳۶۲/۱۲۴۱ - شیخ جابر انصاری، تاریخ اصفهان و ری، تهران ۱۳۲۲/۱۴۰۶ - حسن

بن محمد قی، کتاب تاریخ قم، تهران ۱۳۲۰/۱۳۱۲ .

¹ Salmān-i Sāwaġī, the poet laureate of the Čalāyirs, is a case in view. He died in 778/1376. On him see BROWNE, *LHP*, III, 260 ff.; and 'Azzāwī, *Tārīħ*, II, 151–2 and *passim*. The latter scholar has used Sāwaġī very effectively in his sections on early Čalāyīr history. Other poets include Ibn-i Yamīn, 'Ubaid-i Zākānī, and Ḫwāġī Kirmānī. On them see BROWNE, *LHP*, III, 211–57.

² Written in 828/1424–25, and based partially in a work of the same title by Niẓām ad-Dīn Sāmī done about a quarter of a century before.

³ Ibn 'Arabshāh was a native of Damascus, studied at Samarcand, and died in Cairo, 854/1450.

critical and personal narrative. Both works taken together, however, furnish us with a fairly complete picture of Timūr's exploits. On the Timūrid period and the relations between the Timūrids and their western possessions in Irān, very important information can be gathered from the works of such celebrated historians as Ḥāfiẓ-i Abrū, 'Abd ar-Razzāq Samarqandī, Mu'in Isfazārī, and Faṣīḥī-yi Ḫwāfi¹.

The fifteenth century as a whole has also been fortunate in having two well-known historians, Mirhwānd and Ḫwāndamīr, whose *Raudat as-Ṣafā* and *Habib as-Siyar* respectively are indispensable for a proper understanding of the period just before the emergence of the Ṣafawids². Unfortunately very little space is devoted by these two writers to the Turkmān dynasties whose history is so vital for a correct evaluation of this century. However, chronicles on the Qara-qoyunlu and Aq-qoyunlu dynasties are not lacking, and recently an important work on the later history of the Aq-qoyunlus, namely Ibn Rūzbihān Ḥungī's *Tārīh-i 'Ālam-ārā-yi 'Aminī*, has been made available³. Work was completed on another Aq-qoyunlu chronicle, the *Tārīh-i Diyārbakrīya*, which deals with the era of Uzūn Ḥasan⁴. The sections on the Qara-qoyunlu preserved in the Arabic MS. *at-Tārīh al-Ğiyāṭī* contribute very valuable material of a contemporary nature which still has to be assessed and evaluated by comparison with other available sources⁵.

Mention should be made of later chronicles which appeared during the Ṣafawid period itself but which contain very valuable information and significant data on the fifteenth century. Among these are Hasan-i Rūmlū's *Aḥsan at-tawārīḥ*, Gaffārī's *Tārīh-i ḡahān-ārā*, and Iskandar Munšī's *Tārīh-i 'Ālam-ārā-yi 'Abbāsī* – to mention only three of such chronicles⁶.

These dozen or so works written within a century of each other provide rich historical material for the period under study. They should however be supplemented by many other works of a biographical nature – works that deal solely with the lives of poets and literary figures, of mystics and *sūfi* leaders, of saints and holy men, and other such *tezkerēs* without which the

¹ Ḥāfiẓ-i Abrū completed *Zubdat at-tawārīḥ* in 829/1426, (see also Felix TAUER, *Cinq opuscules de Ḥāfiẓ-i Abrū, concernant l'histoire de l'Iran au temps de Tamerlan*, Prague, 1959); Samarqandī's *Majla' as-Sā'dain* covers the period between the last Mongol Ilhānid ruler Abū Sa'id and the death of Abū Sa'id the Timūrid (in 873/1468–69); Isfazārī's *Raudat al-ğannāt* on the history of Herat is carried down to the year 875/1470–71; the *Muğmal-i Faṣīḥī* (till 854/1442) is a very useful summary.

² *Raudat as-ṣafā* of Mirhwānd brings the narrative down to 873/1468–69 (end of Book VI). Book VII (written probably by Ḫwāndamīr) covers the history of Māwāra'annahr till 912/1506–7. A continuation of this work by Rīzā Qull-ḥān Ḥidāyat (entitled *Raudat as-ṣafā-yi Nāṣirī* in 3 volumes) carries the narrative on to the mid-19th century. Ḥidāyat's views on the coming of the Ṣafawids (at the beginning of his continuation) are noncritical. Ḫwāndamīr's *Habib as-siyar* was written in 929/1523 and, although unimaginative, still it contains the full traditional account on the rise of the Ṣafawids.

³ Edited by V. MINORSKY under the title *Persia in A.D. 1478–1490*, in an English summary translation, (published by the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland, Luzac, 1957). The original Persian text is being prepared for publication by Mr. John E. Woods (who is also finishing his Ph. D. thesis at Princeton University on the Aq-qoyunlu Turkmāns).

⁴ *Tārīh-i Diyārbakrīya* edited by Faruk SÜMER of Ankara University and Necati LUGAL, Ankara, 2 vols. 1962–64.

⁵ On *at-Tārīh al-Ğiyāṭī* by 'Abd Allāh ibn Fāṭḥ Allāh al-Baghdādī, see now M. Schmidt-Dumont, *Turkmēnische Herrscher des 15. Jahrhunderts in Persien und Mesopotamien nach dem Tārīh al-Ğiyāṭī*, in press (according to a personal communication from Dr. H. R. Roemer, Freiburg im Br.), July 1970.

⁶ Rūmlū's *Aḥsan at-tawārīḥ* is a Ṣafawid history from 900–986/1494–1578, edited and translated by C. N. SANDON, v. I, text, (Baroda 1931) and v. II, translation (Baroda 1934). Iskandar Munšī's *Tārīh-i 'Ālam-ārā-yi 'Abbāsī* was written in 1026/1616 for Shāh 'Abbās, while Gaffārī's *Tārīh-i ḡahān-ārā* was completed in 972/1564. An invaluable list and analysis of Ṣafawid and other chronicles is given by M. B. DICKSON in Appendix II, "Sources and Bibliography" (pp. xlvi–lxiii) of his *Shāh Tahmāsb and the Usbeks: The Dual for Khorāsān with 'Ubayd Khān, 930–946/1524–1540*, (Princeton University, Ph. D. thesis, May, 1958).

cultural, intellectual, and religious aspects of this history cannot be properly studied or appreciated. These have been a primary and invaluable source for our work as will be seen in future chapters¹.

So far mention has been made of works composed in the area and mainly in Persian, the literary language of the entire region under consideration. Reference however should be made to the equally important writings in Turkish in the Ottoman Empire. 'Āşıq-pāshā-zādē is an important contemporary source², while Muṇāggim-bāšī's original Arabic work, the *Gāmī' ad-duwal*, uses material not available from other sources³.

From the eastern part of our region, works in Čagatay Turkish become gradually more important towards the end of the period. Mīr 'Alī-Şir Nawā'i's *Mağālis an-Nafā'*⁴, and Bābur's *Memoirs*⁵ are two works in question. The literature produced in Ḥurāṣān and Māwarā'annahr, although of less importance for our immediate purposes, throws very useful light on the reactions in Central Asia to the rise of the Ṣafawid state in Irān. Equally important are the works done in Mamlūk Egypt during the fifteenth century by such notable figures as al-Maqrizī, Ibn Tagrī-birdī, and as-Sahāwī, to mention only three of them⁶. The *sunnī* reaction to the rise of *šī'ism* in Irān is perhaps best exemplified in their works.

Other indigenous material of great significance for the period as a whole is the so-called *munšiyānē* literature, i. e., the extensive correspondence between the various courts and rulers. The *Mukātabāt-i Rašīdī* of the great Mongol minister Rašīd ad-Dīn Faḍl Allāh⁷, and the later

¹ For a partial list of the most important *təshoros* see the section entitled: «بعضی از مهمنت‌ترین نکرهای تاریخی» in the introduction to v. I of Rıza Qulī-hān Hıdāyat's *Magma' al-fusahā'*, edited by M. MUŞAFFA (1334/1956). See also the section on *Šī'i* (*imāmi*) biographical works in MUHSİN AL-AMĪN, *A'yān aš-Šī'a*, v. I, pt. 2, pp. 117-127.

² Born in 803/1400, and died sometime after 889/1484. Aşıq-pāshā-zādē's *Tawārif-i Āl-i Osmān* was first edited by 'ALI BEV, Istanbul 1332/1913-14. A German edition appeared in Leipzig in 1929: *Die ottomanische Chronik* . . ., ed. by Friedrich GIESE. A more recent Turkish edition by C. N. ATÇIZİ appeared in *Osmanlı Tarihleri*, I. (Istanbul 1949). On the author see "Aşik-pāshā-zāde", a short entry by Taeschner in *EI*, new edition.

³ Muṇāggim-bāšī, Ahmad ibn Luṭf Allāh, died on 29 Ramaḍān 1113/27 February 1702 in Mecca. A Turkish translation of his *Gāmī' ad-duwal* appeared under the title *Şahāfi al-abbās* (3 volumes, Istanbul 1285/1868). It was done by the poet Nedim Ahmed Efendi in the 18th century (on Nedim see Sami FRA-SCHERY, *Qāmūs al-a'lām*, VI, 4571). The original work of Muṇāggim-bāšī has not yet been published in its entirety. V. MINORSKY has edited sections of it in his *Studies in Caucasian History* (1953), and *A History of Sharvān* . . . (1958). See the introductions to these two monographs for a discussion of Muṇāggim-bāšī's MSS. For a description of the five MSS. of *Gāmī' ad-duwal* available in Istanbul, see A. DISTRECK in *Orientalia*, XXVII, n. s., pt. 3 (1958), 262-68.

⁴ Composed in Čagatay Turkish in 896/1490-91. Two 16th century Persian translations of this work (by Fahrī Hirātī and Ḥakīm Sāḥī Muḥammad Qazwīnī) were published in one volume (Tehran, 1323/1945) by 'Alī Asgar ḤIKMĀT. For details on these translations and other MSS. see introduction to this publication.

⁵ The narrative of the *Memoirs*, better known as the *Bābur-nāma*, extends to the year 936/1529-30.

⁶ The leading Egyptian writers of the 15th century and their major works are: a) al-Maqrizī (d. 846/1442), *al-Mawdīz w al-ī'tibār fī ḫikr al-bīṭār w al-Ūjār*, and *as-Sulūk li-ma'rīf al-duwal al-mulūk*; b) Ibn Ḥaṣar al-'Asqalānī (d. 853/1449), *ad-Durar al-kāmina*; c) al-'Aini (d. 855/1451), *Iqd al-ḡumān*; d) Ibn Tagrī-birdī (d. 875/1470), *an-Nūgūm az-żāhirā*, *al-Manhal as-Ṣāfi*, and *Hawḍīj ad-dishūr*; e) as-Sahāwī (d. 903/1497), *al-Tibr al-masbūh fī dail as-Sulūk*, and *ad-Dau' al-lāmī' li-ahl al-qarn at-tāsi'*; f) as-Suyūṭī (d. 911/1505), *Husn al-muḥādara*, and *Tārīħ al-hulafā*; g) Ibn Iyās (d. 931/1524), *Badrī' as-zuhūr*. For a comprehensive discussion of these writers and their works see Muḥammad Muṣṭafā Zīyādā, *al-Mu'arrīħūn fī Miṣr fī al-qarn al-hāmis-āšar*, (2nd edition, Cairo 1954).

⁷ Edited by Muḥammad Šāfi' (Lahore 1947); but see R. LEVY's sharp criticism of the historical worth of these *muhādabāt* in "The Letters of Rashīd ad-Dīn Faḍl Allāh", JRAS (1946), 74-78. Levy believes the letters are of Indian provenance. Z. V. TOGAN, however, thinks these letters to be significant. See his article mentioned in p. 15, note 5. In "notes" received (July, 1970) from Professor H. R. ROEMER of Freiburg Uni-

collections known as the *Munšā'āt-i Salāṭin* of Feridūn Bey¹ are two very important sources for this period. Unfortunately the greater part of this correspondence is still not available for the scholar in printed form². Of special importance in this respect is the chancery correspondence preserving the *fīrmāns*, *soyūrgāls*, etc., of the ruling dynasties of this period³.

These are the indigenous sources indispensable for a proper understanding of the political and cultural history of Irān, Iraq, and Anatolia during the 250 years – and the list is by no means exhaustive. There is in addition, however, a mass of foreign sources that deal with the area in a somewhat second-hand fashion, i. e., the European travelers and adventurers who visited the area or passed through it, then returned home to write accounts of their exploits. In many cases, the accounts written bore no direct relation to the state of affairs; and there is no doubt that the misconceptions propagated by these ill-informed travelers did not conduce very much to the desired rapprochement on the international level between Irān and some of the Western powers. There is no doubt that this travel literature is important. Its importance, however, should not be too exaggerated and should be kept in secondary position after the native sources. At best it can only serve as corroborative evidence⁴.

versity, he draws attention to I. P. PETRUSHEVSKY's refutation of LEVY's views on *Mukātabat-i Rašīdī* in "K voprosu o podlinnosti perepiski Rašīd ad-dīna", *Vestnik Leningradskovo Universitata*, 1948, No. 9.

¹ Ahmad Feridūn Bey's *Munšā'āt*, compiled in 982/1574–75, were published in two volumes, Istanbul, 1274/1858. According to V. MINORSKY (*EJ*, first edition, s. v. "Uzūn Hasan"), the letters are "very valuable documents and of undoubted authenticity". Cf. Mükrimin Halil's تورك تاريخ انجني in "فریدون بلک مندان" – v. 14, pts. 1–6 (Istanbul, 1340/1921) pp. 37–46, 95–104, 216, and 226, where he examines a few early letters of the *Munšā'āt* dealing with the period of Ḥorān and points out the *tāfrīf* in them.

² Since this was written, a volume of *munšiyān* material has appeared, edited by 'Abd al-Ḥusain Nāwālī, under the title:

أسناد و مکاتبات تاریخی ایران – از تیمور تا شاه اسماعیل (تهران، بگاه ترجمه و نشر کتاب، ۱۳۴۱/۱۹۶۲)

The sources for this handsome volume are: (a) *Munšā'āt-i Haidar Ev-ogli*, (b) *Munšā'āt-i Feridūn Bey* (see n. 1 above), (c) Three MSS. of the Bibl. Nationale, Paris, and (d) *Munšā'āt – Ḫwāga Sīhāb ad-Dīn 'Abd Allāh Marvārid* also of the Bibl. Nationale. See introduction to this work, p. 23. More recently, D. SĀBITİYĀN published a work on *munšiyān* literature entitled:

(۱۳۶۰/۱۹۸۲)

The author (and compiler) appears to be primarily interested in the style (*sabk*) of such diplomatic correspondence.

³ See for example the important contribution by Heribert BUSSE: *Untersuchungen zum islamischen Kanzleiwesen* (an Hand Turkmenischer und Safawidischer Urkunden), Cairo 1959, (Abhandlungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts Kairo, Islamische Reihe, Band 1).

⁴ On travel literature: In addition to the early travellers, Marco Polo, de Clavijo, Afanasy Nikitin, Schiltberger, Bertrandon de la Broquière, and others later travellers such as Pietro della Valle (1586–1652), Tavernier (1605–1689), and Chardin (1643–1713) are useful. Of special importance for our period is Giosofat Barbaro (d. 1494), *Travels to Tana and Persia* (Hakluyt, 1st ser., No. 49, 1873). This volume also contains *A Narrative of Italian Travels in Persia in the 15th and 16th Centuries*. For bibliographical information on travel literature during this period see Raphael du Mans (1613–1696), *Estat de la Perse en 1660*, (ed. Ch. SCHEFFER, Paris 1890), and A. GABRIEL, *Die Erforschung Persiens; die Entwicklung der abendländischen Kenntnis der Geographie Persiens*, (Wien 1952), especially section 1, "Die Verläufer", Chapters 4, 5, and 6, p. 32 ff. on Marco Polo, the Timurid period and the Venetian envoys. In talking about travel literature one must not forget the Muslim travellers such as Ibn Battūta (*Rihla*), and Ibn Faḍl Allāh al-'Umari (*Masālik al-absār* – only sections of this encyclopedic work have been published to date), whose works are of primary importance for Anatolian history at this period. For an example of the slavish and utterly unjustifiable dependence on such secondary sources as the European travellers, try to read S. N. FISHER, *The Foreign Relations of Turkey, 1481–1512*, (Un. of Illinois Press, Urbana, 1948), Chapter VII, "War with Persia and the Suppression of Heresy, 1500–1511", p. 90 ff.

There is however another type of European material during this period which does deserve more attention. These are the various *relazioni* of the Venetian ambassadors and consuls in the area, chiefly those of the Bailo in Istanbul. The collections of Eugenio Alberi are very useful in this regard¹.

Of this type of literature, and in fact sometimes considerably more important, are the *Diarii* of Marino Sanuto the Younger who most painstakingly put down in 58 volumes of minutely written diaries the happenings of the world drawn from the deliberations of the Venetian Senate². He often supplemented the "official" stories with attempts at getting information on his own. Sanuto's diaries often read like a detailed Ottoman history book in view of the close ties between his country and the Ottoman Empire during the 36 year span of the diaries (between 1498 and 1534). These diaries have not yet been fully utilized in secondary works³.

In modern scholarship, the period under study does not lack its native historians. No attempt shall be made at exhaustiveness, but the works of the Persian scholars 'Abbás Iqbál, Muham-mad Qazwíni, and Ahmad Kasrawí; the Iraqi scholar 'Abbás al-'Azzáwí; and the Turkish doyen of scholars Mehmed Fuad Köprülü, are examples of scholarship that equals if it does not surpass that of their fellow orientalists⁴. Some of the researches of these scholars have unfortunately been neglected.

¹ Eugenio ALBERI (1809-1878), ed., *Relationi degli ambasciatori Veneti al Senato*, 15 volumes: ser. I, v. 1-6; ser. II, v. 1-5; ser. III, v. 1-3, "Relazioni degli stati Ottomani"; and Appendice. See also the documents in Guglielmo BERCHET (1833-1913), *La repubblica di Venezia et la Persia*, (Torino 1865).

² Marino SANUTO (1466-1535), *I diarii di Marino Sanuto*, . . . pubblicati per cura di R. Fulin, F. Str-fani, N. Barozzi, G. Berchet, (and) M. Allegri, (Venezia 1879-1903), 58 volumes, plus a very useful "Prefazione" done after the work had been published in 1903 by BERCHET.

³ See, however, an article by Fr. BABINGER, "Marino Sanuto's Tagebücher als Quelle zur Geschichte der Safawijja", in T. W. ARNOLD and R. A. NICHOLSON, *A Volume of Oriental Studies Presented to Edward G. Browne* . . ., (Cambridge, 1922) pp. 28-50. I have used the *Diarii* as a major source in an unpublished paper on the early period of Sāh Tahmāsb.

⁴ 'Abbás Iqbál's *Tārīh-i Muṣṣāl-i Irān*, though intended for use primarily as a college textbook, still, for its size, it is a very useful secondary source for the period between the Mongols and Timur. Its treatment of the post-Mongol dynasties in Irān is comprehensive and balanced. (It is rather unfortunate that Iqbál did not live to complete his work. Only Volume I is extant, and has recently been reprinted. Iqbál's articles in the old Persian journal *Yādīgār* are of special importance.

Muhammad Qazwíni's *Yād-dāshthā*, recently published in several volumes, were found to be useful on specific points. Ahmad Kasrawí (Tabrizi), to quote V. MINORSKY, ". . . possessed the spirit of a true historian. He was accurate in detail and clear in presentation. Among his accomplishments was a good knowledge of Arabic and Armenian." *Studies in Caucasian History*, p. 3, n. 1. Kasrawí was assassinated in Tehran on December 20, 1945, under very suspicious circumstances. M. K. Azāda in his *Cīrd Kasrawī-rd kuštānd?* (Tehran 1325/1947), lists as many as 72 published works by Kasrawí in Persian, and 4 in Arabic. For a more detailed list of Kasrawí's works, showing place of publication, editions, and pages, see Hānbābā Mušār, *Mu'allifin-i kutub-i Čāpi-yi Fārsi va 'Arabi*, (Tehran 1340/1962), v. I, cols. 437-446; and for Kasrawí's articles (some of which later appeared in book form) see İraq Arşār, *Fihrist-i maqālid-i Fārsi* or *Index Iranicus*, (Tehran, 1340/1962), Index, s. v. "Kasrawī, Sayyid Ahmad (Kasrā'i)". 'Abbás al-'Azzáwí's *Tārīh al-'Irāq bain iħil-lāin*, in several volumes, is an important secondary source for this period. Although the author avoids making value judgements, his often verbatim quotations from the original authorities - often not easily accessible otherwise - makes his work all the more useful. His quotations from the 15th century MS. *al-Tārīh al-Giyāfi* are of particular importance for our purposes. The three volumes used for this work carry the following subtitles: v. 1, *The Mongol government, 656-738/1258-1338*; v. 2, *the Galāyir government, 739-814/1338-1411*; v. 3, *the Turkmān governments, 814-941/1411-1534*. These three volumes were published in Bagdad, 1935-39. A very good and comprehensive work of a bio-bibliographical nature by AL-'Azzáwí is his *al-Ta'rif bil-mu'arriħin*, v. I: The Mongol and Turkmān period, 601-941/1204-1534, (Bagdad 1376/1957). The work includes very useful information on most of the Arabic, Persian, and Turkish authorities for our period.

M. F. Köprülü's articles in the early volumes of *Türkiyat Mecmuası* are very important for Anatolian history of this period. Ghulam SARWAR's work on Sāh Ismā'il is another example of sound oriental scholarship.

Among the Western scholars, Edward Granville BROWNE was a pioneer in the field of Persian studies. His *Literary History of Persia* in four volumes shall remain for a long time a standard work in spite of its many shortcomings¹. E. J. W. GIBB's eight volumes on the history of Ottoman poetry is less useful for our purposes but it is very valuable for the Ottoman side of the picture².

However, Vladimir MINORSKY's work on the latter part of this period, i. e. on Turkmān history, stands out by itself as the most accomplished treatment of Iranian history during the fifteenth century. His articles in the *Bulletin* of the School of Oriental and African Studies of the University of London are a treasure of the most useful and scholarly information on Turkmān affairs³.

Among the German writers, the works of HINZ, BABINGER, CASKEL, SPULER, and ROEMER are of great importance in tackling specific problems of the period⁴. They are done in the best tradition of German scholarship. The French Jean AUBIN, Henri CORBIN, and Claude CAHEN have dealt with specific problems and edited several valuable manuscripts on this field⁵. Finally Vladimir BARTHOLD's work on Central Asia is of great value to the understanding of post-Timūrid times⁶.

In spite of this tremendous wealth of material at our disposal one cannot refrain from saying that much still lies locked up in manuscript collections both in the area and outside. Until this material is brought out, critically edited and studied, our information on post-Mongol pre-Şafavid Irān will remain incomplete.

¹ Volume III deals with the history of Persian literature "under Tartar dominion" from A. D. 1265 to 1502; volume IV is on "modern times" from 1500 to 1924. Attention should be drawn to an often neglected chapter in Browne's volume IV, namely Chapter 8, "The Orthodox Shī'a faith and its exponents, the mujtahids and mullahs", pp. 353-411, which contains a cogent, though not very interpretative, summary of Twelver Shī'ism, as well as useful references to the better known Shī'i works.

² In particular Volumes I and II, which cover the period from the origins to 1520 (the end of Sultan Selīm's reign).

³ V. MINORSKY's so-called "Turkmenica" articles are listed in *BSOAS*, XVI (1954), 271. Four more are mentioned in the "Foreword" to MINORSKY's *Persia in A.D. 1478-1490*, p. vii, which "small book completes the dozen". See also his "Les études historiques et géographiques sur la Perse", in *Acta Orientalia*, 10 (1932), 278-83; 16 (1938), 49-58; 21 (1950-53), 108-123; and 22 (1957), 105-117 - these being the published forms of four papers read at the 18th, 19th, 21st, and 23rd Orientalist congresses held in Leyden, Rome, Paris, and Cambridge (England) respectively.

⁴ One needs to refer, in this general context, first to Berthold SPULER's *Die Mongolen in Iran: Politik, Verwaltung und Kultur der Ilchanzeit, 1220-1250*, 2nd edition, Berlin, 1955, and particularly to the extensive bibliography (pp. 465-502) which, among other things, lists the Persian, Syriac, Armenian, Georgian, Mongolian, Chaghatay, Greek, Arabic, Chinese, Spanish, Portuguese, Russian, and Hebrew source materials; and secondly to Walter HINZ's pioneer work, *Irans Aufstieg zum Nationalstaat im fünfzehnten Jahrhundert*, Berlin and Leipzig 1936. (On the problems involved in HINZ's approach to Şafavid history see MINORSKY's comprehensive review of the work in *BSOAS*, IX (1937-9), 239-43; and BAUSANI's comment in *Persia Religiosa*, 410.)

⁵ French scholarship appears to be concentrated on the religious-mystical and social-economic aspects of the history of this period. In addition to the three scholars mentioned in the text above recognition ought also to be made to the recent work on the Naqshbandī Order by the late M. MOLÉ. See for example his "Naqshbandīyat" in *Farhang-i Irān-zamin*, VI (1337/1959), 273 ff.

⁶ In this general survey reference needs to be made here to *Four Studies on the History of Central Asia* by BARTHOLD translated from the Russian by V. and T. MINORSKY: v. I (a) A Short History of Turkestan, and (b) History of Semirechye; v. II. Ulughbeg; and v. III. Mir 'Ali-Shīr. One cannot begin to write on the importance of BARTHOLD's work for Central Asian and, indirectly, for Iranian medieval studies. For other Russian/Soviet scholarship on the Şafavid period, M. B. DICKSON lists the following names: PETRO-SHEVSKIY, MIKLUKHO-MAKLAY, GORDLEVSKIY, ALIZADE, ARUNOVA, ARUTYUNIAN, ASHRAFYAN, EFENDIEV, FIL'ROZE, PAPAZYAN, REYSNER, and SHAKHMALIEV. See his "The Fall of the Şafavl Dynasty", a review article of Laurence LOCKHART's book of the same title, *JAOS*, 82 (1962), 503-17.

CHAPTER III

S'I'ISM UNDER THE MONGOLS

The religious situation in the Muslim world under the Mongols has not yet been investigated in its entirety¹. The Mongol Hāns remained for a long time uncommitted in religious matters, and there are indications that they toyed with various religious ideas representing Muslim, Christian (Nestorian), and Jewish affiliations. To these should be added the prior religious beliefs of the Mongols in Central Asia – mainly those beliefs deriving from shamanist tradition among the Mongol tribes that moved westwards under Gingiz-hān and later Mongol warrior leaders.

Before any general statements could be made about this subject, and before arriving at any definite conclusions, the whole question of religion under the Mongols and their final acceptance of Islam has to be thoroughly investigated. Only two aspects of this immensely complicated topic will be dealt with in this and the next chapters: one, dealing with certain Muslim scholars who represented "high Islam" during the early Mongol period, and the temporary triumph of *iqnā'asārī Sī'ism*; and the second, discussing the rise and early history of one of the leading Sūfi orders during the same period at the level of "folk Islam".

¹ A preliminary attempt to examine the religious question under the Mongols was made by Manūčehr MURTAZAWI in two articles: «دین و مذهب در مهد ایلخانیان ایران» which appeared in *Nāṣriya-yi Dāniškada-yi Adabiyat*, Tabriz, X (1337/1959), No. 1, pp. 17-80; and which «نکل بر مقاله دین و مذهب در مهد ایلخانیان ایران» which appeared in the same bulletin, XI (1338/1960), No. 2, pp. 160-184. In talking about the "inclination of Gāzān towards Sī'ism" (p. 45 ff.) and the "Sī'ism of Sultān Muḥammad Ḥudābanda" (p. 48 ff.), MURTAZAWI uses Ḥāfiẓ-i Abrū's *Mağma' al-lawdrīḥ as-Sulṭāni* (MS., Malik Library, Tehran) in what appears to be a special *fāṣl* on Sī'ism during the Ilhānid period. (Abrū's work is called *Mağma' al-lawdrīḥ as-Sulṭāni* by Faṣḥī of Ḫwāf, and it was concluded in 829-30/1426-27. See BROWNE, *LHP*, III, 425, and RIEU, *Pers. Cat.*, p. 422a. According to *Mağlis al-Mu'minīn*, 8th *mağlis*, Abrū was Ṣāfi'I. See reference in the former of the two articles by MURTAZAWI, p. 70). Another related article by MURTAZAWI is: «تصوّف در دوره ایلخانیان» which appeared in the same journal, IX (1336/1958), pp. 297-337. MURTAZAWI has since republished all this and additional material in book form which appeared under the title: «حقیق در باره ایلخانیان ایران (دین و مذهب - تصوّف - تاریخنگی)» - (Tehran, 1341/1963). Muṣṭafā Ṭāhā BADR discusses one aspect of the religious problems during the Ilhānid period in his *مغول ایران بین المحبة والاسلام* (Cairo, Dār al-Fikr al-'Arabi, n. d.), namely that of the attempts by the West to win over the Mongol *ḥāns* to Christianity. Both the discussion and the bibliography (pp. 127-130) are most inadequate. The internal picture in Irān at the time is wholly disregarded.

Reference should now be made to Chapter 7, "Religion under the Mongols" (in *The Cambridge History of Iran*, Volume 5, *The Saljuq and Mongol Periods*, ed. by J. A. BOYLE, Cambridge, 1968) contributed by A. BAUSANI, Professor of Persian in the Oriental Institute, University of Naples, pp. 538-549. With statements like, "The trend towards Shi'ism in many circles was due above all to mysticism, which at this time revealed many interesting Shī'i features" (p. 545); and "In any case, Sūfism with a Shī'i tinge remains the most important feature in Iran at this time, especially in view of later developments" (p. 547). BAUSANI has lent weight to the argument developed in this chapter. BAUSANI's earlier work, *Persia Religiosa: da Zarathustra a Bahā'u'llāh* (Milan, 1950) is a milestone in its genre.

One way in which certain aspects of the religious picture during the Mongol period can be profitably understood is to take certain well-known religious thinkers of the time and examine some of their pertinent works. The representative writers treated in this section are perhaps the most celebrated and, in some cases, the most highly controversial figures in the religious life of the Muslim world during the early part of the period under consideration. Their choice, as will presently appear, is not altogether arbitrary¹.

One of these scholars, al-Hasan ibn Yūsuf ibn al-Muṭahhar al-Hilli (d. 726/1324–25), whose work has already been referred to in connection with the introduction of *iṣnā'aṣarī Šī'ism* in Irān by Shāh Ismā'il², was the most influential Šī'i divine of his time and had great influence at the Mongol court of Sultān Ulğaitū Ḥudābanda.

Another, Naṣir ad-Din Tūsi (d. 672/1273), is perhaps better known as an astronomer and ethical philosopher rather than as a religious thinker³, yet he commanded such an important stature at the Mongol court in Baḡdād and was so intimately involved with the destruction of Ismā'ili power at Alāmūt that a look into some of his religious views will shed much light on the religious question during the early Mongol period. Tūsi's apparently hesitant position between the *īsmā'ili* (sevener) and the *iṣnā'aṣarī* (twelver) persuasion of Šī'ism makes him all the more significant for our purposes.

On the other hand, a consideration of some of the writings of Ibn Taimiya (d. 728/1327) – perhaps the most controversial Muslim thinker of the later Middle Ages – will serve to place the ideas of his younger Šī'i contemporaries (Tūsi and Ibn al-Muṭahhar) in better perspective. For Ibn Taimiya's incessant attacks against the *iṣnā'aṣarī* views of Ibn al-Muṭahhar and Tūsi, the *īsmā'ili* activity of the remnants of the Alāmūt enclave, and the extreme (*gulāt*) excesses of the Nuṣairi sect of Syria, reveal some of the most burning issues in the Muslim world at the end of the thirteenth and the beginning of the fourteenth centuries.

As a traditional "neutralist" living in tranquil seclusion between Širāz and Tabriz, Qādi Naṣir ad-Din al-Baiḍāwī (d. 685/1286) will serve as an example of the apparent heedlessness of *sunnī* orthodoxy to the strong, and often violently conceived and executed, heterodox movements that were in the air. As a Šāfi'i jurist, Baiḍāwī wrote what is still considered one of the best and most authoritative commentaries on the Qur'ān in the *sunnī* orthodox tradition.

The four eminent scholars lived in the three or four most important centers of the Muslim world during this period⁴. Tūsi was in Baḡdād and later at Marāqā in Ādārbaigān where the famous observatory was constructed with Mongol funds to help him with his astronomical studies (and perhaps to reward him for his services in assisting Hulagu to capture the Ismā'ili

¹ For a list of the names of 51 'ulamā under the high Ilhānid period, see the letter sent by Rašīd ad-Dīn Faḍl Allāh to his son Amīr 'Alī, governor of Baḡdād, specifying government "subsidiaries" (in the form of currency, clothing, and beasts of burden) to be granted to each of them. The letter, as well as the representative 'ulamā listed in it, is worthy of a special study which should throw very useful light on the religious activity during the Mongol period. Among those listed: Quṭb ad-Dīn Širāzī, Baiḍāwī, 'Aqdūd ad-Dīn Iḡī and his brother, a son of Naṣir ad-Dīn Tūsi, and Ibn al-Muṭahhar al-Hilli. *Mukhtabat-i Rašīdī*, letter No. 19, pp. 56–69.

² See Chapter I, p. 6 above.

³ The reference here is to Tūsi's work on astronomy, the *Zīg-i Ilhāni* and to his *Aḥlāq-i Nāṣirī* (which has been better known in Dawwāni's recension the *Aḥlāq-i Galāti* made for Uzūn Hasan Aq-qoyunlu; translated by W. T. THOMPSON as the *Practical Philosophy of the Muhammedan People*, London 1839). A translation of Tūsi's *Aḥlāq*, under the title *The Nasirean Ethics*, done by G. M. WICKENS of Toronto University, is now available in English (London 1964).

⁴ Two other scholars have been considered in this chapter since their work bears close relation to the material discussed. These are the 15th century leading Sunnī author Faḍl Allāh ibn Rūzbihān Ḥunḍī, and the 16th–17th great *iṣnā'aṣarī* Šī'i biographer and polemist Qādi Nūr Allāh Suṣtarī. Facts on their lives and works will be mentioned below, p. 30 ff.

fortress of Alamūt and the 'Abbāsid capital of Bağdād). Ibn al-Muṭahhar, whose *nisba* al-Hilli indicates an origin at the *Šī'i* holy places in southern Iraq, spent his active life between Bağdād and the Mongol capital of Sultāniya¹ in 'Irāq-i 'Ağam. Ibn Taimiya was at Damascus all his life except for one or two short trips to Cairo where he was to answer charges made against him to the Mamlūk Sultān and the central government. Qāḍī al-Bайдāwī, as was stated above, lived between Širāz and Tabriz – his birthplace al-Bайдā being south of Širāz.

These four religious thinkers knew much about each other and about what each one did or was doing. They often corresponded²; they were contemporaries living within a generation or two of each other. Some of their works in which they discussed many of the burning questions of the time, and in which each one of them was interested, will be reviewed in the course of this chapter. A comparative study of them will help give a clearer picture of the religious questions at the beginning of our period.

I. *Nasir ad-Din Tusi*

Among Tusi's lesser known works is a short treatise on *imāma*³, in which he undertakes "to write a short essay on the definition (*ma'rifa*) of the third pillar of the *uṣūl* of religion namely a discussion on the imāmate of the righteous *imāms*"⁴. Tusi's treatise is in the form of five

¹ Built by Argūn-bān and enlarged to become capital by Ulğaitū. See MINORSKY, "Sultāniya", in *EJ*, first ed.; Faṣḥī, *Muġmal*, III, 13–14 (year 704/1304–5); and Mirhwānd, *Raudat aṣ-ṣaғīd*, V, 427. Sultāniya was still a capital city under Shāh Ismā'il who spent part of the winter of 912/1506–7 in it. See Šaraf-hān Bidlīsī, *Sarafnāma*, II, 126. (However, at the end of the 16th century, Bidlīsī tells us that the city had been destroyed and had nothing except remnants of its walls. *Ibid.*, II, 25.)

² On correspondence between Ibn al-Muṭahhar and Baiḍāwī, for example, see *Nāma-yi Dānišwārān-i Nasīri*, VIII, 140; Ḥwānsārī, *Raudat al-Ğanndī*, gloss p. 175; and Mağlisī, *Bihār al-anwār*, I, 214–15 of the introduction. Mağlisī (*ibid.*, I, 211) also mentions that Ibn al-Muṭahhar read *kalūm* with Tusi, and the latter read *sīgh* with Ibn al-Muṭahhar.

³ Published under the title *Risāla-yi Imāmat* as part of a collection of short works by Tusi, which appeared in 1335/1956 on the occasion of the 7th centenary of the death of the great thinker. Our *Risāla* is No. 302 of Tehran University Publications (Intishārāt-i Dānišgāh-i Tehrān), and is edited by Muhammed Taqī Dānišpāzūh. The others in the collection are Nos. 296, 298, 300, 301, 302, 304, 307, and 308 of the same series. Each work is individually paginated. For MSS. of the *Risāla* (which is not listed in KANTŪRİ or BROCKELMANN) see the introduction to the present edition, and Muhammed Taqī Mudarris Rāzawī, *Aħwāl-o-đayr . . . Tusi*, Tehran University publications No. 282, (Tehran, 1334/1955), pp. 51 and 198–99. Two other works by Tusi contain sections on *imāma* which bear close resemblance to the text of the *Risāla* under discussion. These are: *Fusūl-i ḥwāḍja-yi Tusi* (Tehran University Publications No. 298 – Persian and Arabic texts printed side by side), pp. 34–41, section entitled *nubuwat-o-imāmat*; and *Taqīd al-'aqd'id* (or *al-kalām*), section 4 "*fi n-nubuwā*" and section 5 "*fi l-imāma*". (For details on Tusi's *Fusūl* and for various *šurūk* on them see Mudarris Rāzawī, *ibid.*, 249–53. For commentaries, glosses, and super-glosses on the *Taqīd*, see *GAL*, I, 670–72 and *Suppl.*, I, 925–27, and Mudarris Rāzawī, *ibid.*, 241–45. The best known commentary on Tusi's *Taqīd* is IBN AL-MUṬAHHAR's *Kaṣf al-murād fi ṣarḥ taqīd al-iṭiqqād*, (Qumm, 1372/1952); see particularly section 5, pp. 225–250.)

Tusi wrote chiefly in Persian, but many of his works were translated into Arabic for the benefit of the scholars in Iraq. Mudarris Rāzawī (*ibid.*, 260) quotes the following:

وچون اکثر مؤلفات دی (یعنی نصیر الدین طوسی) که برای ولات و حکام زمان خود و بر حسب در خواست آن ساخت و پرداخته بفارسی است، واژ این جهت تعمش عام نبود و زدیلک طلاب عراق مشهور نگشته بود برای آنکه دیگران نیز از آن کتاب متفع گردند بر آن شدم که آنچه از کتاب فارسی او را بدست آورم بعربي ترجمه کنم».

(From the introduction to a translation of Tusi's *Awṣaf al-astṛāf*, done by Rukn ad-Dīn Muhammed ibn 'All al-Gurğānī/Gurgānī, a student of Ibn al-Muṭahhar al-Hilli. Rukn ad-Dīn translated also Tusi's *Fusūl*, *Asās al-iqtibās*, *Aħlāq*, and others.)

⁴ Tusi, *Risāla*, 13:

questions which according to him cover all the aspects relating to the subject of *imāma*¹. His answers to these questions are very brief and succinct, almost cryptical. The first four questions do not interest us much here; the fifth, however, is rather crucial. For it is in the answer to "Who is the rightful *imām*?" that a person has to commit himself one way or the other (i. e., between the *sunnī* or *shī'ī* views). Tūsi does this very aptly and syllogistically: "The unanimity (*iğmā'*) of the entire people of the world is right; i. e., the ideal is to have universal and total unanimity. If they disagree, the right is that upon which the people of Islam by themselves are unanimous. If the people of Islam disagree (among themselves), the right is that upon which the righteous people (*ahl al-haqq*) are unanimous. These are they who believe in unity or oneness (i. e. *tawhīd*), justice, prophecy, and the *imāmate* on the basis stipulated by reason and confirmed by tradition. If you know this you should also know that people have disagreed on this matter. Some said that there was no need for the *imām* at all. Others maintained that the people should (among themselves) appoint an *imām*. And others believed that the appointment of the *imām* is a duty from God. Enough has been said to prove the correctness of those who hold to the last view, and the error of the others."²

Having thus singled out that group among Muslims with whom the right is, Tūsi goes on to talk specifically about the appointment of the rightful *imām*. So he says: "They (the Muslim community) disagreed on the question of the appointment of the *imām*. The last group, which believed that the appointment of the *imām* is a duty from God, have maintained that the *imāms* are twelve certain ones from the family of the Prophet. The others maintained other ones each to his own group. You have learned, however, that the truth should be among the whole people. Therefore, since those who believe that the appointment of the *imām* is not obligatory are in error, the truth of the views of the *iqnā'aśarīs* becomes evident."³

After establishing in this way the correct position of the *shī'ī* Twelvers regarding the appointment of the *imām*, Tūsi tackles again very briefly and to the point, another highly controversial matter, namely that of the infallibility ('iṣma) of the *imām*. Certain Muslims, he says, believe that 'iṣma is the necessary attribute to the *imām*, while the rest have denied this. Those who maintained it adopted the views of the *iqnā'aśarīs*, and the others adopted other views. It has been shown that the truth was with them there (i. e., with the *iqnā'aśarīs* regarding the appointment of the *imām*), so it must be with them here (i. e., regarding his 'iṣma). Otherwise, the *ummā* would be unanimous on error and falsehood⁴.

In this way Tūsi has maintained the views of the *shī'ī* Twelvers regarding the appointment by God of the *imām*, as well as the *imām*'s infallibility. He then raises a few questions one of

Referring to the *imāmats* as the "third pillar" is difficult to explain. With Sh'īs, *imāma* is considered second only to *nubuwwa*. The Orthodox schools treat the *imāmate* as one of the *furu'*.

The name of the questioner who had asked Tūsi to write the treatise is given as 'All ibn Nānāwar, who is curiously further described as "one of the (members of?) Ihwān as-Ṣafā" – an appellation with possible Ismā'īlī overtones. On the relations between the Ihwān and the Ismā'īlīs see B. Lewis, *The Origins of Ismā'īlīsm*, 17, 44, 50, and 94. (However, using the words "ihwān as-safā" could be for *sag'* purposes, riming with "gawī al-'ahd wal-wafā').

¹ The questions are reduced to five short interrogative particles: What? Is? Why? How? and Who? The full questions are then expressed roughly as follows: *What* is the *imām*? (i. e. the meaning of the term in accordance with usage ('urf) and convention). *Is* the *imām* always in existence, or does he exist only at certain times? or never? *Why* should there be an *imām*? i. e. the condition that requires his presence. *How* is the *imām*? i. e. the qualities that he should possess. And finally, *who* is the *imām*? i. e. who should be the *imām* in the time of the hegemony of Muslim law? Tūsi *Risāla*, 15.

Translating Tūsi's language is not always an easy matter. Clarity has sometimes to be sacrificed for exactness. It is the philosopher who is writing rather than the religious exponent.

²⁻⁴ Tūsi, *Risāla*, 23.

which is of special interest since it touches directly upon the beliefs of the other great sector of ſī'i Islam, namely the Seveners (*sab'iyyūn*). "If someone says," Tūsi goes on, "that the Seveners too believe that the *imām* is appointed by God, and that he does not commit reprehensible acts, and therefore they (the Seveners) also should be in the right, . . . I reply . . . that the Seveners have dissociated themselves from the Muslim community by claiming the eternity of bodies (*qidam al-āgsām*) and other myths. In denying the defection from duty and the committing of reprehensible acts from the *imām*, they do not (specifically) say that the *imām* does not choose to do such acts, but they say rather that all actions of the *imām* are acts of obedience (i. e. to God) whether these be the telling of falsehoods, despotism, the drinking of wine, or adultery. Since their views are manifestly wrong," Tūsi concludes, "we have not taken them into consideration with the other statements."¹

This condemnation of the views of the Seveners is not easy to explain since it has been maintained that Tūsi did at some time entertain certain Ismā'ili ideas and beliefs². Some of his works were written from an Ismā'ili point of view where he does speak of *bāṭinī* and *zāhiri* aspects of knowledge³. The story of how Tūsi was for sometime a captive of the Ismā'ilis and of how he assisted the Mongols in capturing the Alamūt stronghold is too well-known to deserve repeating here⁴. It will be sufficient here to present the judgement of a well-known Tūsi scholar who said that his "political attitude was determined by his strong sympathy with the Twelvers, which made him . . . a leader of the Iranian-Ši'a oligarchy on the Mongol side against the Caliphate"⁵.

¹ *Ibid.*, 23–24.

² Tūsi's celebrated work, *Aḥlāq-i Nāṣirī*, was written at the request of Nāṣir ad Dīn Muḥtaṣam the governor of Quhistān under the Ismā'ili ruler 'Alā' ad-Dīn Muḥammad. In an earlier preface to the work Tūsi praises his patron; later he withdraws his former praises "of those infidel rulers, and orders the former preface to be cancelled". ETHE, *Cat. of the Persian MSS.*, I, No. 2155, cols. 1181–2. On Tūsi and the Ismā'iliis of Quhistān see also 'Abbās Iqbāl, *Tārīħ*, 501–2.

³ See for example W. IVANOW, "An Ismailitic work by Nāṣir al-Dīn Tūsi", *JRAS* (1931), 527–64. See also DĀNISPĀZŪH, «گفاری از خواجہ طویل» in *Maqalla-yi Dāniškada-yi Adabiyat* of Tehran University, III (1335/1957), No. 4, pp. 82–88, where he quotes Tūsi as saying (p. 83):

در علم حقیق روش شده است که وراء عالم حسوس عالی دیگر هست معمول که نسبت آن عالم باین چون نسبت جان با آن باشد.
واز اینجاست که آزا عالم روحانی میگیرند و این را عالم جسمانی. و بیانه حسوس درین عالم معمول در آن عالم است، و مقابل هر شخص
ازینجا روسی در آنجا، و نظری هر ظاهری اینجا باطنی آنجا . . .

⁴ This incident, however, does not call for E. G. BROWNE's simple judgement (in *LHP*, II, 457) that Tūsi was a "double-dyed traitor"; nor, for that matter, ARBERRY's remark that Nāṣir ad-Dīn chose "quiescing prosperity" under the Mongols rather than "freedom in exile" which Ḡalāl ad-Dīn Rūmī preferred! See A. J. ARBERRY, *Classical Persian Literature*, (London 1958), p. 26.

⁵ R. STROTHMANN, "al-Tūsi", *EI*, first ed.; see also his *Die Zwölfer Schī'a*, (Leipzig 1926). For a more recent summation of STROTHMANN's views on the subject see his "Schīiten und Charidschiten" in *Handbuch der Orientalistik*, VIII/2, (Leiden and Köln 1961), 476–495. Cf. Henri LAOUST, *Essai sur . . . b. Tāsimīya*, (Cairo 1939), p. 36, where he accepts Tūsi as ". . . représentant profondément convaincu de la doctrine duodecimaine . . ."

'Abbās al-'Azzāwī's judgement of Tūsi (in his comments about an article on Nāṣir ad-Dīn at-Tūsi, written by Sulaimān Dāhir in the Journal of the Arabic Language Academy of Damascus, v. 36, pp. 241–47) is very sweeping. He says:

لن الفروري أن نقول أنه (أي نصير الدين الطوسي) اتعامل مع الإمامية ويتصف مع غالبية الصوف: ونصيري مع التصيرية وإنماشرى مع الإثني عشرية. وزيد أنه متكلم مع أهل السنة من المتكلمين لأن الإمامة تامة خالفة فيها أهل السنة.

See his "Ta'liq 'alī maqāl Nāṣir ad-Dīn at-Tūsi", in *Maqālat al-Maqāma al-'Ilmi al-'Arabi*, v. 37, No. 2, (Damascus, April 1962), pp. 207–215.

'Azzāwī's compatriot, the Iraqi scholar Muṣṭafā Ġawād, in a recent article attempts to rehabilitate Tūsi and explain some of the motives in his relations with the Ismā'iliis, the caliphate in Baġdād, and with

Tūsi's treatise on the imāmate ends with a short reference to the *mahdi*, an important aspect of Shī'i doctrine: "As to the disappearance (*ga'iba*) of the Twelfth Imām and the length of its duration, it should not be far-fetched among those who believe that God is Almighty and Omniscent."¹

Giving his short but definite views on three of the most basic tenets of Twelver Shī'ism (i. e., the imāmate, the infallibility of the *imām*, and Mahdism), Naṣir ad-Din Tūsi places himself right in the middle of the *īṣnā'aṣārī* tradition. On this basis, he may be considered as a major link between the older Shī'i master, his fellow countryman, Muḥammad ibn al-Hasan at-Tūsi, *Saīb at-Ta'ifa* (d. 458/1066), and later Shī'i divines*. He earned for himself in the long line of Shī'i scholars the title of *al-Muhaqqiq*².

2. Ibn al-Muṭahhar, Ibn Taimiya, Ḥunḍi and Šūstarī

Tūsi's student and the next scholar to be dealt with in this general view is Ibn al-Muṭahhar al-Hilli³.

Ibn al-Muṭahhar was responsible, perhaps more than any other single person, in perpetrating the cause of Twelver Shī'ism during the Mongol Ilhānid times. His life span (648-726/1250-1325), covering as it does the last half century of the thirteenth and the first quarter of the fourteenth century, almost coincided with the period of Ilhānid hegemony in Irān⁴.

Hulagu, Čawād stresses Tūsi's humanitarian outlook and tolerance; however, he died an *imāmi*. See Čawād's article: "امام ناصر الدين الطوسي بوجهه الشفاعة الإسلامية أيام المغول" in *Yaddnāmā-yi ḥwāqā Naṣir ad-Dīn Tūsi*, v. I, (Tehran 1336/1957), Publications of Tehran University, No. 416, pp. 86-115; (Added t.-p.: *Le Mémorial de Khwadjah Nassir al-din Toussi*, v. I, Conferences . . . 27 Mai - 2 Juin, 1956).

¹ Tūsi, *Risāla*, 24.

² Abū Ḩa'far Muḥammad ibn al-Hasan at-Tūsi, *Saīb at-Ta'ifa* (d. 458/1066), is known as the author of two of the Shī'i "four books", namely *al-Iṣlābār* and *Taqdīb al-akhbār* (the other two are: al-Kulainī's *al-Kāfi* and Ibn Bābawayh's *Man lā yaḥduruhū al-saqīh*). He also wrote the well-known *Fihrist kutub al-Shī'a*, ed. A. SPRENGER, Calcutta, 1853. On Muḥ. ibn al-Hasan at-Tūsi see *GAL*, I, 512-13, and Muḥammad at-Tunakābūnī, *Qisāṣ al-'ulāmā*, (Tehran, n. d.), pp. 414-16.

³ According to his will Tūsi was buried in the shrine of the seventh Imām Mūsā al-Kāzim. See Ḥwāndāmir, *Ḥabib as-siyar*, III, 106:

در جامع رشیدی مسکور است که خواجه ناصر الدین وصیت فرمود که اورا در جوار مزار فیض آثار امام زرگوار موسی الكاظم علیه السلام دفن کنند.

According to 'Azzāwī (*Tārīħ*, I, 278), the tomb in which Tūsi was buried had originally been intended for the caliph an-Naṣir. See also the long entry in Šūstarī, *Mağālis*, 328-31, on Tūsi, where further reference is made to Tūsi's burial at the Shī'i shrine.

A summary of his *Aḥlāq* was commissioned in high Ṣafawid time by Shāh Ṣafl (1039-52/1629-42); and a short collection of prayers on the Twelve Imāms (*Dawādah-i Imām-i ḥwāqā Naṣir*) is still in manuscript form in Mašhad. See Mudarris Rāzāwī, *Aḥwāl-o-Āfār*, 259 and 317-18.

⁴ To give him his full name and some of the titles, he was known as: الْمُدْلَّةُ آئُّهُ جَالِ الدِّينِ الْمُحَمَّدُ بْنُ يَوسُفٍ بن علٰى بن الطَّهْرِ الْمُلْكِ (648-726/1250-1325).

⁵ Two other famous Shī'i scholars ought perhaps to be mentioned at this point, one belonging to the same period as that of Ibn al-Muṭahhar, and the other to the next generation. The former is Ča'far ibn al-Hasan al-Hilli, "al-Muhaqqiq al-awwal"; on him see above, p. I, n. 2, and below, p. 28, n. 2. The latter is Muḥammad ibn Makkī al-Āmīlī, "aš-Šāhid al-awwal, al- 'allāma at-Tābi'ī", who was put to death in Damascus in 786/1384; on him see *GAL*, II, 131, and *Suppl.*, II, 131-2 (BROCKELMANN gives his death date as 782/1380). Tunakābūnī, *Qisāṣ al-'ulāmā*, 337-42, Šūstarī, *Mağālis*, 241, and Muḥammad Ridā Šāms ad-Dīn, *Hayāt al-Imām as-Sāhid al-Awwāl*, (an-Nagāf, 1376/1957); and below, p. 66 ff.

In a letter from Raṣīd ad-Dīn Fadl Allāh to his son Amr 'Allī, governor of Bagdād, Ibn al-Muṭahhar is listed among 51 'ulāmā who were to receive bounties from the Mongol court. He is assigned 2,000 dinars, a fur cloak, and a horse and saddle. Similar things are given to Baidawī, İğlī, and others. See *Muḥādhabat-i Raṣīdī*, letter No. 19, pp. 56-69.

Reference has already been made in the introductory chapter of this work to Ibn al-Muṭahhar's *Qawā'id al-Islām*, which was the only book on Twelver Shī'ism to be found when Shāh Ismā'il established the new religion in Irān¹. A work carrying this specific title, however, could not be found among the many works of Ibn al-Muṭahhar².

A comprehensive analysis of Ibn al-Muṭahhar's views and his place in Shī'i literature and the Shī'i world in general is best gained from a consideration of two of his most controversial works. This will give us a more significant insight into the religious problems involved during the early part of the period which we are considering, as well as the repercussions during the high fifteenth century.

The first work, *Minhāj al-karāma fī ma'rīfat al-imāma*, was refuted by none other than Ibn Taimiya, the great contemporary and bitter opponent of Ibn al-Muṭahhar³. The second, *Nahq al-haqqa*, was refuted violently by Faḍl Allāh ibn Rūzbihān Ḥunqī, the great 15th century Aq-qoyunlu sunnī scholar, whose refutation was in turn later refuted by the equally famous Shī'i author Qāḍī Nūr Allāh Šuštari during the next century.

¹ See Chapter I, p. 6.

² BROCKELMANN lists two works carrying the title *Qawā'id al-Islām*, one by 'Izz ad-Dīn as-Sulamī (d. 661/1262), and the other by an Ibāḍī author; *GAL*, Suppl. I, 767, and Suppl. II, 349. al-Ḥwānsārī, *Raudat al-fannāt*, 172, mentions 70–90 works by Ibn al-Muṭahhar. It could be that the book in question was known by another name, a phenomenon not very uncommon in Muslim books particularly those of a religious character, where later commentators would often refer to earlier books by either shorter or slightly different titles. Among Ibn al-Muṭahhar's works is one carrying the title *Qawā'id al-akhām*; *GAL*, II, 211, and *Suppl.*, II, 207 (lith. Tehran, 1329/1911). Āgā Buzurg, *Dari'a*, II, 496, and Kantūrī, *Kaṣf*, 417. Another work has the title *al-Akhām al-ṣarī'a 'alā madhab al-Imāmiya*; *GAL*, II, 211, and *Suppl.*, II, 208. It is also possible that ascribing the *Qawā'id al-Islām* to Ibn al-Muṭahhar was wrong to begin with, and the work may very well be by an equally famous Shī'i Twelver scholar and Ibn al-Muṭahhar's own uncle and teacher, Ǧa'far ibn al-Hasan al-Hillī, "al-Muhaqqiq al-Awwāl", (d. 676/1277), who is also the author of an important work on *īmāni* law called *Sārā'i' al-Islām*. (Naḡm ad-Dīn Ǧa'far ibn al-Hasan ibn Yaḥyā ibn Sa'īd al-Hillī, "al-Muhaqqiq al-Awwāl", was born in Hilla in 602/1205, and died in Bagdād in 676/1277. For his works see *GAL*, I, 514–15 and *Suppl.* I, 711–12. On him see also Tunakabūnī, *Qisāṣ al-ulamā*, 364–67, where his death is given as 726/1325. See also above Chapter I, p. 1, n. 2. His book the *Sārā'i' al-Islām* was translated by A. QUERRY as *Droit Musulman. Recueil des lois concernant les musulmans schyites*, 2 volumes, (Paris 1871–1872); the translator was French Consul in Tabriz. A summary of *Sārā'i' al-Islām*, under the title of *al-Muhiṣar an-nafī' fī fiqh al-Imāmiya*, was published in Cairo (2nd ed., 1377/1957–58). Indeed, a well-known work by Ibn al-Muṭahhar, called *al-Bāb al-hādi'aṣar* (well-known on account of the availability of William MILLER's English translation, *al-Bābū 'l-Hādi 'Ashar: a treatise on the principles of Shi'ite theology*, London, the Royal Asiatic Society, 1928) could very well be the same *Qawā'id al-Islām* under another title. This work was an addition ("the eleventh chapter") by Ibn al-Muṭahhar to a summary which he made of one of Naṣr ad-Dīn Ṭūsī's works. (Ṭūsī's work is *Miṣbāḥ al-muqtahid*, and Ibn al-Muṭahhar's summary is entitled *Minhāj al-ṣalib*, in 10 chapters. See MILLER, op. cit., Introduction, xi, and Commentary on the text, 3.)

³ The work was brought to Ibn Taimiya's attention in Damascus where it must have found some sympathetic readers. See LAOUST, *Essai sur . . . b. Taimiya*, 36–37. Ibn Taimiya's refutation according to its summarizer ad-Dahabi (al-Ḥāfiẓ Abū 'Abd Allāh Muḥammad ibn 'Uṭmān, 673–748/1274–1348; on him see article by Moh. BEN CHENÉS/J. DE SOMOGYI in *EI*, new edition, s. v.; his summary is entitled *al-Muntaqd min . . .*, ed. by Muhibb ad-Dīn al-Ḥāfiẓ, Cairo, 1374/1954), one of Ibn Taimiya's more famous students, carries the title *Minhāj al-i'tidāl fī naqd halām ahl al-raṣd wa-al-i'tizāl*. Ibn Taimiya's original work was published under the title *Minhāj as-sunna an-nabawīya fī naqd halām al-Shī'a wa al-qadariya*, Cairo, Bulaq, 4 volumes, 1321/1903. Ibn Taimiya rarely gave titles to his works; see ad-Dahabi, *al-Muntaqd*, 17, n. 1. Ibn al-Muṭahhar's *Minhāj al-harāma* was composed for the Mongol Ḥān Ulğātū: (أي بالكتاب)

خِزَانَةُ السُّلْطَانِ الْأَعْظَمِ مُلُوكَ طَوَافَتِ الْرَبِّ وَالْجَمِيعَ شَاهِنَاهَ غَيَاثَ الْمُلَكَ وَالْدِينِ خَدَابِهِ.

ad-Dahabi, *Muntaqd*, 25. The full text of the dedication appears to have been tampered with and shortened by ad-Dahabi, who in his own introduction (pp. 17–24 of the published edition are by ad-Dahabi, the summary proper begins on p. 25) dismisses Ibn al-Muṭahhar's work and his views and the views of his co-religionists as follows:

Ibn al-Muṭahhar's *Mīnhāj al-karāma* is a work on *imāma* written for "the king of the kings of the Arab and Persian peoples", the Mongol Ilhānid Sultān Ulğaitū Ḥudābanda¹. It is in five parts: the first on *imāma* according to the various schools, the second on the necessity to follow the *imāmī* school in this respect, the third on the proofs of the imāmate of 'Ali, the fourth on the Twelve Imāms, and the fifth on the invalidation of the caliphates of Abū Bakr, 'Umar, and 'Utmān².

Ibn al-Muṭahhar's opening statement that the question of *imāma* is the most important in religious matters and the most notable subject to all Muslims receives the following retort from Ibn Taimiya: "His statement that the question of *imāma* is the most important subject is a lie by the unanimous view (*iğmā'*) of all Muslims, for belief (*īmān*) is more important."³

Ibn Taimiya proceeds to prove his point by the usual references to Qur'ānic and ḥadīt quotations⁴. He then recounts a meeting he had once with one of the *imāmīs*, and ridicules the *imāmī* view on Mahdism: "You and I are students of religious science, of truth, and of proper guidance. The *imāmīs* say that he who does not believe in the awaited one (*al-mahdī*) is an unbeliever (*kāfir*). Have you seen him? Or have you seen anyone who saw him? Or do you know any of his sayings? . . . You demand (allegiance) to a child of three or five who

وقلت معرفتهم بالدين والعلم . . . وقد دخل منهم على الدين فساد ما لا يصحه إلا رب العباد، والتصيرية والإسماعيلية والباطنية من باهم دخلوا والكافر والمرتنة بطريقهم وصلوا، فاستروا على بلاد الإسلام وبعوا الحرام وسفكوا الدم المحرام.

(ad-Dahabi, *Muntaqā*, 18).

ad-Dahabi goes on in his condemnation by saying that the *rāfiḍīs* (a general term which often covers all non-Orthodox Muslims; here the intention is for the followers of Ibn al-Muṭahhar, i. e. the *ifnā'aṣāris*) are similar to the Jews in their deceit and capriciousness, and like the Christians in their extremism (*kušūw*) and ignorance. Among Ibn al-Muṭahhar's predecessors he lists Naṣr ad-Dīn Ṭūsī. Compared to them (i. e. to the *ifnā'aṣāris*), he adds, the Hawārīg are the most truthful people. The Shī'i practice of *taqiya* (dissimulation) is understood by ad-Dahabi as pure and simple hypocrisy (*nifāq*): Dahabi, *Muntaqā*, 20, 22. In his refutation of Ibn al-Muṭahhar's work, Ibn Taimiya – as is customary in works of this nature – quotes the original text in paragraphs and sections, and then begins his comments by pointing out the errors which in his opinion the author had fallen into. From these quotations the original work can thus be restored and reconstructed. (Ibn Taimiya's *Mīnhāj as-Sunnah* was not available for consultation, and so references throughout will be to ad-Dahabi's *Muntaqā*. A recent edition of *Mīnhāj as-Sunnah* (Cairo 1964–) contains the text of Ibn al-Muṭahhar's *Mīnhāj al-karāma* given separately at the beginning.)

¹ The period of the Ilhānid Sultān Ulğaitū Ḥudābanda (703–716/1304–1316) was active in religious and theological discussions. His grand vizir, Raṣīd ad-Dīn Faḍl Allāh wrote the *Fawā'id-i Sulṭāniyya*, which are "his conversations with the Ilhān Ulğaitū concerning religious and philosophical questions"; TOGAN, "The Composition of the History of the Mongols . . .", *Central Asian Journal*, VII, I (1962), p. 60. According to TOGAN (*ibid.*, 62) the *Fawā'id* "represents the theology of the period of Ulğaitū, who was wholeheartedly engaged in various theological discussions." On the Shī'i situation in general during the reign of Ulğaitū, see SPULER, *Die Mongolen in Iran*, 190–91. Ulğaitū had a mobile school which moved with the royal train. Ibn al-Muṭahhar wrote some of his works at this school. See Ḥwānsārī, *Rauḍat al-Ğannāt*, 176, and Ibn al-Muṭahhar, *Kitāb al-alfāīn al-fāriq bain as-ṣidq wa l-main*, (Nağaf, 1372/1952), v. I, Introduction, and v. II, p. 184. See also 'Umarī, *Masālik* (in Klaus LECH, *Das Mongolische Weltreich*), p. 98:

درون عادة هذا السلطان (أي أوجلانت خداينه) أن يصحبه في الأند魯 وفي كل حل ورتحل أعيان من العلماء والمدرسين برواتب جاريات مثل السلطان، ومع كل منهم فمهما، وطلبه، وعلوه، هم المسئون بمدرسی السيارة.

² Ibn Taimiya/ad-Dahabi, p. 25.

³ *Ibid.*

⁴ Ibn Ḥaḡar al-'Asqalānī, the 15th century Shāfi'i jurist, in his biography of Ibn al-Muṭahhar (*ad-Durār al-Kāmina*, II, 71), comments briefly on Ibn Taimiya's refutation of Ibn al-Muṭahhar's work and says that Ibn Taimiya acquitted himself well, "but he carried his arguments too far in several places by refuting certain ḥadīts which are in fact existent albeit of poor authority which Ibn Taimiya said were fabricated or spurious". Ibn Taimiya's work is here referred to by its more popular title: *ar-Radd 'ala r-rāfiḍī*.

entered a tunnel four hundred and sixty years ago . . . while we have been ordered to obey existing and known *imāms* who exercise temporal power . . .”¹.

Every statement of the original work is taken and fully discussed and finally refuted on the authority of other *hadīts*. These statements include such things as the excessive reverence by the *Ši'i*s of the tombs and of *Ši'i* holy men “so much so that some of them consider the pilgrimage to these shrines more important than the pilgrimage to Mecca” (p. 51, also 158–159); the problems of the attributes of God and his names (p. 80 ff.); the views of Naṣir ad-Din Ṭūsi are also attacked (p. 107)²; the question of predestination (p. 129); the position of Mu'awiya and the Umayyads vs. the *Ši'a* (p. 252); the issue of the infallibility of the *imām* (p. 415 ff., and *passim*); the question of the famous *hadīt* of Ḥumm and the family of the Prophet, ‘īra (p. 475)³; and matters relating to the collusion between the Mongols and the *Ši'a* and the assistance by the latter in the surrender of Bağdād and the involvement of Naṣir ad-Din Ṭūsi in this matter (pp. 325–27); and others.

In one of his less violent moods, however, Ibn Taimiya sums up what the real attitude of a *sunnī* Muslim is towards the followers of heterodox principles: “Among the *rāfiḍis* are those who are pious, devout, and ascetic; but they are not – despite these qualities – like the followers of other sects. The Mu'tazilites, for example, are more reasonable, more knowledgeable, and more religious; among them lying and immorality are less than among the *rāfiḍis*. The Zaidi *Ši'a* are better and closer to truth, justice, and the knowledge of religious science. There is no group among the sects who is more truthful and more devout than the Ḥāriġites, and in spite of that (i. e., in spite of their enmity to Orthodox Muslims) the people of the Sunna treat them with justice and equity, and do not molest them, for injustice is prohibited in the absolute . . . Indeed, the people of the Sunna are better to every one of these sects than they are to each other. In fact, the Sunnis are better and more just to the *rāfiḍis* than some of the *rāfiḍi* groups are to each other.”⁴

With this perhaps most balanced statement of the book we leave Ibn Taimiya⁵ and go on to consider the other work of Ibn al-Muṭahhar, namely the *Nahq al-haqq*.

Ibn al-Muṭahhar's *Nahq*, like the first work just discussed, was also composed upon the orders of the Mongol Sultān Ulġaitū⁶. After a short introduction Ibn al-Muṭahhar begins immediately to discuss the first problem, that of reason (*idrāk*)⁷. However, Faḍl Allāh ibn Rūzbihān Ḫunqī⁸, as well as Qādi Nūr Allāh Šūštari⁹, each talk in their introductions at some

¹ Ibn Taimiya/ad-Dahabi, *Muntaqā*, 27, and 30–31.

² *Ibid.*, 160: وَقَالَ (ابن المطهَر): الْوَجِهُ الْأَنْفَلُ فِي الدِّلَالَةِ عَلَى وجوب اتِّباع مذهب الإيمانِ ما قاله شيخنا الأعظم خواجه نصير الدين محمد بن حسن الطوسي قَسْ أَنَّه رَوْحَه، وَقَدْ سَأَلَهُ عَنِ الْمَذَاهِبِ فَقَالَ – بَعْثَتْ عَنْهَا وَعَنْ حَدِيثٍ سَعْتَرَقْ أَمْتَهُ مَلَادِثْ وَسَبْعِينَ فَرْقَةً فَوْجِدَنَا الْفَرْقَةُ النَّاجِيَةُ إِلَيْهِمْ بِإِيمَانِهِ جَمِيعَ الْمَذَاهِبِ . . .

³ وَأَنَّ تَارِكَ فِيكُمْ مَا إِنْ تَمْسِكُمْ بِهِ لَنْ تَفْلِذُ كِتابَ أَنَّهُ وَعْرَقَ . . .

⁴ Ibn Taimiya/ad-Dahabi, *Muntaqā*, 328.

⁵ Ibn Taimiya's work, however, was itself attacked in a rebuttal by Muḥammad Maḥdī AL-KĀZIMI, *Minhāj as-Šāfi ar-radd 'alā Ibn Taimiya*, (Naqāf, 1346–47/1927–28), in 2 volumes, a modern work.

⁶ Šūštari, *Ihqāq al-haqq*, I, 76, n. 1 (In this note the editor quotes the full text of the *ḥuṣba* (introduction) of Ibn al-Muṭahhar's *Nahq al-haqq*.)

⁷ “Reason” is perhaps not the best rendering of *idrāk*, since Ibn al-Muṭahhar really means “understanding” and the power of how man can know God. His refuter, Ibn Rūzbihān, hurries to point out this usage and states that Ibn al-Muṭahhar actually means to say “sight” (*ru'yā*); Šūštari, *Ihqāq*, I, 79.

⁸ On Faḍl Allāh ibn Rūzbihān Ḫunqī: (a) For a brief entry on him see Ḫwāndamīr, *Habib as-siyar*, IV, 607, under Ḫwāga Maulānā Isfahānī:

⁹ وَجُونَ خَواجَهُ . . . دَرْ مَنْهُبَ تَسْنَنْ بَنَاتِ مَتَّصِبَ بَودَ، دَرْ زَمَانَ ظَهُورَ دُولَتِ شَاهِي (يُعنِي صَفَويَهِ) از آذَرْ بَاجَانَ بَهْرَاتَ آمَدَ . . . He gives his death date on 5 Čumādā I, 927/1521. – (b) Šūštari, *Ihqāq*, I, Introduction, 74–82; and II,

length about the original work (i. e. *Nahg al-haqq*), and briefly outline the reason for its composition. In his preface, Qādi Nūr Allāh also discusses Ḥunḡī's refutation and comments briefly about the Sunni author and his life¹.

Referring to the Šī'īs take-over under the early Ṣafawids Ibn Rūzbihān Ḥunḡī says in his introduction: "... A group of heterodox people occupied the land and disseminated *rāfiḍī* views and sectarianism among the people. This has forced me to leave my fatherland and choose exile after bidding farewell to the beloved ones and to my friends. So I left my town of İsfahān and reached Qāṣān where I settled ... where the views of the people of the Sunna and the Community (*ahl as-sunna wal-ğamā'a*) were spread, and where there were no sectarianism and atheism (*iḥkād*)."²

While in Qāṣān³, on the first leg of his travels which were to carry him ultimately to Ӯzbek territory in the East, Ibn Rūzbihān came across Ibn al-Muṭahhar's work, the *Nahg al-haqq*,

Introduction, 57–64, where a reference is made to an article on Ibn Rūzbihān written by a descendant of the family which appeared in *Fārhang-i Irān-samīn*, IV, No. 3 (1335/1957), p. 183. (This article was not available for consultation. In it there is mention of a maternal uncle of Ḥunḡī, al-Hāwga Čamāl ad-Dīn Ismā'il as-Sā'iḍī, who was vizir of Pīr Budāq of the Qara-qoyunu.) – (c) Hwānsārī, *Rauḍat al-fannāt*, 500–501 (short entry referring to his refutation of Ibn al-Muṭahhar's *Nahg*, then indulges in a vile reference to a daughter of Ibn Rūzbihān who seems to have gone astray). – (d) Ahmad Iqtidārī, *Laristān-i kuhān: taḥqīq dar bāra-yi Laristān-i qadīm*, (Tehran, 1334/1956). In a section on the famous men of Laristān, many are from the Rūzbihān family. On Faqīl Allāh are two lengthy entries: 143–145, 187–192. Thirteen of his works are listed (190–92), one of which, the *Diyārbakriya* is wrongly ascribed to him. – (e) Ḥunḡ the town, south-east of Šīrāz towards the Persian Gulf (see Kaihān, *Gugrāsiyā-yi muṣāṣṣal-i Irān*, II, 231), was a bastion of Sunnism. According to J. Aubin ("Note sur quelques documents Aq-qoyunu, 133, n. 3) the archives of the town were destroyed during the period of Nādir Sāh. – (f) Fasa'i, *Fārsnāma-yi Nāṣiri*, Pt. 2, 197–98. (No mention of Ibn Rūzbihān!). – (g) Faḍūlīlāh b. Rūzbihān al-İsfahānī [AL-ḤUNĀDĪ], *The Sulūkū l-mulūk*, edited by the late M. Nizamuddin 1966 in Hyderabad (Dn.), but available only some years later when the manuscript of this book had already been sent to the press.

¹ On Qādi Nūr Allāh Sūstārī, see his *Iḥqāq*, I, Introduction, 82–161.

² A short guide to Sūstārī's *Iḥqāq al-haqq*: The work, as published by the Kitābfurūšī-yi Islāmiya of Tehran, is in essence three books in one. This is how it left the hands of the third author Qādi Nūr Allāh, who, in writing the work, quoted at first the original author (Ibn al-Muṭahhar), then the second author (Ibn Rūzbihān,) then he presented his own views on both, refuting the latter and confirming the former. This is done topic by topic, section by section, and sometimes even paragraph by paragraph and sentence by sentence. Ibn al-Muṭahhar's words are introduced by the expression – those of Ibn Rūzbihān by the expression – and Qādi Nūr Allāh's contributions by the word *أقول* – and Qādi Nūr Allāh's contributions by the word *أقول*. In addition to these three texts, the work contains also (this time in footnotes) extensive comments by Sīhāb ad-Dīn an-Naġaffī, a modern author. Naġaffī's comments often occupy several pages at a time – the text is thus interrupted and the comments take up all the page. In addition, Naġaffī has introduced the entire work by a 161-page preface (which in fact carries the special title or rubric: *كتاب اللئال المتنبه والدرر* and which deals with the book itself, pp. 12–35, the life of the 'Allāma Ibn al-Muṭahhar, 35–70, that of Ulḡaitū, 70–73, that of Ḥunḡī, 74–82, and finally that of Qādi Nūr Allāh himself, 82–161). The general editor – who one must admit has done a very good job of handling all this material – is al-Hasan al-Gaffārī. In addition to the table of contents there is a separate and extensive table of contents of the notes and comments of Naġaffī, as well as other appendices. The one important thing that is missing is a general index. A thorough study of the work as a whole is an education in Šī'ism, Islām, and in fact in the whole span of Muslim history and thought. Volume I appeared in 1376/1956, v. II in 1377/1957, and v. III in 1378/1958. The publication is still not completed (or, more correctly, all the work is still not available to the present writer). However, the section that will interest us most in the present discussion, namely that on *imāma*, begins in v. II, 286. (Already v. VIII of the *Iḥqāq* has appeared in 1384/1964–65).

³ Sūstārī, *Iḥqāq*, I, 25–26 (of the text). See also Ḥunḡī/Minorsky, *Persia*, 7, and n. 1.

⁴ On locating Qāṣān, and the problem of identifying it with either Kāshān in Irān or Kāshān (Qāṣān) in Māwarā'annahr, see Manūčehr Sutūda's edition of Ḥunḡī's *Mīhmān-nāma-yi Buhārī* (Tehran, 1341/1963).

read it, and set out to refute the arguments outlined in it. Before he begins the main part of the refutation, however, he heaps a few derogatory epithets on the author whose adherence to the beliefs of the Twelve Imāms he finds difficult to accept. He himself holds these Imāms in the highest esteem and goes on to quote some of his own poetry in their praise¹. He then mentions reasons for his undertaking, stressing unwittingly the following which shows definite signs that *iṣnā'aṣari* Ši'i books were being keenly sought by the new Ṣafawid regime: "When I reviewed the contents of that book and reflected upon the appearance of the *bīd'a* of the *imāmi* sect and its elevation in the land, so much so that they resorted to erasing the traces of *sunnī* books . . . I began to wonder that the corruption of the times might lead the *imāms* of delusion to exaggerate the propagation of this book, and may even make of it a basis for their corrupt views . . ."²

Qādi Nūr Allāh, on the other hand, provides us with more details concerning the original composition of the book by Ibn al-Muṭahhar and the attack on it by Ibn Rūzbihān Ḥunḡī. He says that the sect of the *Iṣnā'aṣariyā*, which he asserts is the only Muslim sect that will be saved on the Day of Judgement³, had had many enemies until the accession of Sultān Ḥiyāt ad-Dīn Muḥammad Ḥudābanda who vacillated at first between the Ḥanafī school and the Ṣāfi'i school⁴. Finally, at a contest which was held in the court between the various schools, Ibn al-Muṭahhar was sent for to appear at court and explain the *imāmi* views which he did well, and the Sultān is said to have accepted *iṣnā'aṣari* Ši'ism and ordered it to be the established religion of the land⁵.

Introduction, pp. 23–24, n. 4. The edition of this work appeared after most of the discussion on Ḥunḡī in this work was completed. Looking at it rather cursorily it is curious to note that Ḥunḡī makes no references to the rise of the Ṣafawids in the West – a sore point on which he makes caustic attacks both in his *Iḥṣāl* (i. e. his refutation of Ibn al-Muṭahhar's *Nahq*) and his *Tārīḥ-i 'Ālam-ard-yi Amini*. This is all the more so in view of the ultimate clash between the *sunnī* Muḥammad Saibānī Ḥān Ozbek (his new patron and the main figure in the *Mihmānndma*) and the rising star of the Ši'i Sāh Ismā'il. However, Mr. Sutūda's introduction to his edition (pp. 11–34) and his bibliography on Ḥunḡī (pp. 33–34) should be checked further for possible additional information on Ḥunḡī and his times.

¹ Šūstārī, *Iḥqāq*, I, 28 (of the text). See also I, 79–80 (of the introduction) where a longer poem in praise of the Twelve Imāms is quoted. The staunch *sunnī* that he was, Ibn Rūzbihān – like most *sunnī* writers – always held the Prophet's family in high esteem. This is an example of the *sunnī* approach in general where practically all views can be acceptable and can find place in the all-enveloping Orthodox beliefs.

² Šūstārī, *Iḥqāq*, I, 33 (of the text). It has been pointed out previously that one of Ibn al-Muṭahhar's works was made the basis for the new Ṣafawid religion. See above Chapter I, p. 6.

³ I. e. *al-firqa an-nāgiya* among the 72 (or 73) sects into which the Prophet is said to have stated the Muslim community will be split.

⁴ Šūstārī, *Iḥqāq*, I, 11–12 (of the text).

⁵ *Ibid.*, I, 13–16 (of the text). The story of this contest is best preserved by Ibn Baṭṭūṭa in his *Rihla* (Beirut ed.), 204 ff./Gibb's transl., II, 302 ff.). The famous traveller who was in the area in Ġumādā II, 727/1326 – a year or two after Ibn al-Muṭahhar's death – adds at the end of his account that the Twelver religion did not last long in ascendancy, and that soon "the Sultān (Ulġaitū) renounced the *rāfiḍi* views and wrote to his provinces demanding allegiance of the people to the views of the *Sunna* and the Community." (*Rihla*, 206/Gibb's transl., II, 304).

On the story of the conversion of Ulġaitū to *iṣnā'aṣari* Ši'ism, see also the following: (a) Šūstārī, *Iḥqāq*, I, Introduction, 35–73, with additions in v. II, Introduction, 52–54. – (b) Ibn Ḥaḡar al-'Asqalānī, *ad-Duvar al-kāmina*, II, 71–72, and III, 378–79. – (c) Ḥwānsārī, *Raudat al-gannāt*, 172–177. – (d) Šūstārī, *Maġālis*, 237–39. – (e) Maġlisī, *Bihār al-anwār*, I, Introduction, 203–216. – (f) Tunakābūnī, *Qīṣaṣ al-'ulāma*, 355–364. – (g) Subkī, *Tabaqat al-Ṣāfi'iyya*, VI, 83–84, under "Qādi Mağd ad-Dīn aš-Širāzī". – (h) Ibn Ḥaldūn, *Tārīḥ*, V, 549. – (i) 'Azzāwī, *Tārīḥ*, I, 407–410, and his *Tārīḥ an-nuqqād al-'Irāqīya*, 52–54. (From the year 707/1307 on Ulġaitū began striking coins with the Ši'i formula *الله اعلم*, *لله اعلم*. See contemporary doggerel on Ulġaitū's coinage in 'Azzāwī, *Tārīḥ an-nuqqād* . . . For a description of a seal of Ulġaitū with the Ši'i formula, see N. SIROUFI, "Notice sur le cachet de Sultan Mogol Oldjaitou Khodabendeh", *J.A.*, ser. 9, No. 8 (1896),

Qādī Nūr Allāh then tells us how Ibn Rūzbihān set out to refute the work. According to him Ibn Rūzbihān did so "as a revenge for the great massacre which befell his co-religionists in Isfahān" on the eve of the rise of the Ṣafawid state¹. He subsequently mentions that Ibn Rūzbihān ran away as a result of that massacre to Māwarā'annahr².

To return to Ibn al-Muṭahhar's own work: as was stated, he begins with a discussion of reason (*idrāk*). He then goes on to discuss the nature of observation (*nazar*). These lead him naturally to a discussion of God's attributes (*ṣifāt*). The question of prophecy (*nubuwwa*) follows, and finally he arrives at the crucial problem, that of *imāma*³.

The first issue that is brought out under the fifth major section of the work is that of the infallibility ('iṣma) of the *imām*. The *imām*, says Ibn al-Muṭahhar, should be infallible (*ma'sūm*). According to the *imāmi* school, he goes on, the *imāms* are like the prophets in the necessity of their being infallible from all misdemeanors and abominations during the entire period from childhood till death whether they committed such actions premeditatedly or by accident. For they are the carriers of the sacred law and are the persons responsible for its application. In this way, their state resembles that of the Prophet⁴.

Ibn Rūzbihān, in his reply to this point, states that according to the Aš'aris the question of *imāma* is not one of the *uṣūl* but rather one of the *furu'*. The *imāmate* with the Aš'aris is (merely) succession (*bilāsa*) to the Prophet in upholding religion and the protection of the tenancy of the community⁵.

331-345). - (j) Mīrhwānd, *Raudat as-safā*, V, 426 ff. (Mīrhwānd ascribes Sh'ism to Ulgaitū himself: «وَجُونْ مَقِيدَةُ الْجَابِرِ سُلَطَانٌ مُحَمَّدٌ خَدَابِتَهُ بِرَجْبَتِ أَهْلِ فَيْنَ وَ دُولَ مَنْطَرِي بِوَدَ فَرِيَانَ دَادَ . . .»)

(k) Faṣḥā, *Muğmal*, III, 24 (year 715/1315-16), who mentions a certain Sayyid Rukn ad-Dīn Abharī, «. . . كَ الْجَابِرِ خَانَ رَا بَلْهَ شَيْهَ تَحْرِيْصَ (عَرِيْضَ : sic.) مَيْكَرْدَ».

(l) Hwāndamīr, *Habib as-siyar*, III, 195:

«أَنَّ بَادِشَاهَ سَعَادَتْ بَنَاهَ يَارِشَادَ آنْجَنَابَ (يَعنِي ابْنَ الْمَهْرَ) مَاتَبَتْ مَلَهَبَ عَلَيْهِ اسْمَاهِ نَعْدَدَ».

¹ Sūstarī, *Ihqāq*, I, 19 (of the text). Cf. Ibn Baṭṭūṭa, *Rihla*, 199-200/GIBB's transl., II, 294-95. Upon describing Isfahān, at one time a beautiful city, Ibn Baṭṭūṭa adds, "But nowadays most of it lies in ruins as a result of the civil war (*sīna*) between the sunnis and the rāfiḍīs. The fighting is still going on among them." (The date is Gūmada II, 727/1326). According to the commentator of *Ihqāq*, Naġāfi, a group of sunni 'ulamā in Isfahān had issued a *fatiwa* calling upon their followers to kill the *Shī'is* of the town. Many of them were massacred. When Shāh Ismā'il came to power he ordered a counter-massacre. See *Ihqāq*, I, 19 (of the text), n. 6. On sectarian troubles in Isfahān at the mid-15th century see Aubin, "Note sur quelques documents Aq-qoyunu", 134.

² Sūstarī, *Ihqāq*, I, 42 (of the text).

³ Ibid., I, 75 ff., 147 ff., 163 ff., II, 190 ff., 399 ff., and all of volume III – respectively.

⁴ Ibid., II, 286-93.

⁵ Ibid., II, 294-304. At the end of his refutation of this section, Ibn Rūzbihān concludes with a couplet containing a pun on the name of Ibn al-Muṭahhar (which means literally: "son of the cleansed one"):

Whenever he comes across good clean words,
He dirties them in the filth of falsehood.
With pure things he mixes his own impurities;
How contaminated Ibn al-Muṭahhar is!

At the end of his own refutation of Ibn Rūzbihān, Qādī Nūr Allāh does not forget to answer back in an equally unlaudatory couplet; this time the play is on Ibn Rūzbihān's first name (Faḍl) which could also mean "left-overs"! *Ihqāq*, II, 305 and 319. Apparently Ibn al-Muṭahhar did not take seriously jokes about his name. It is said he met with Ibn Taimiya while on a pilgrimage to Mecca. The two persons were discussing something together and Ibn Taimiya was impressed and asked, "Who are you?" Ibn al-Muṭahhar replied, "You call me Ibn al-Munaġġas (son of the contaminated one)!" This broke the ice between the two scholars. (The story is reported on the authority of Saḥābi who had heard it from his teacher Ibn Ḥaḡar al-Asqalānī and added it in his own handwriting to a copy of Ibn Ḥaḡar's *ad-Duwar al-hāmina*. See *Duwar*, II, 72, n. 1.)

In his reply to Ibn Rūzbihān's refutations, Qādi Nūr Allāh quotes from such Sunni authorities as Baīdāwī (v. II, p. 307), Ibn Ḥaḡar al-Asqalānī (II, 312), Dawwānī (II, 315), and Taftazānī (II, 317), in support of Ibn al-Muṭahhar's argument!

The second point mentioned by Ibn al-Muṭahhar in his discussion of *imāma* is the view that the *imām* should be the best (*afḍal*) person in the community. The discussion of this point turns around the intention of Ibn al-Muṭahhar in his use of the term itself¹.

This is followed by the question of the appointment of the *imām*. On this matter Ibn al-Muṭahhar has this to say: "All the *imāmis* have agreed that the method of appointment of the *imām* is . . . by a text from God or his Prophet, or by an *imām* whose *imāmate* had been established textually, or through the appearance of miracles performed by him. For the condition of the *imām* is infallibility, which is an esoteric matter known only to God."²

Ibn Rūzbihān, however, replies by presenting the Sunni view that "a person merely by being suitable to the *imāmate* and by possessing its conditions does not necessarily become an *imām*. There is need for another condition: the textual evidence from the Prophet and the previous *imām* requires the unanimity (*iğmā'*) of the Muslim community"³. He also mentions the allegiance (*bay'a*) of those in authority.

In replying to this section, Qādi Nūr Allāh takes the opportunity by commenting that Ibn Rūzbihān deceived the people of Māwarā'annahr by his work which, he admits, was well-received by certain 'ulamā at the court of Saibānī Ḥān of the Uzbeks⁴.

The fourth point under the question of *imāma* deals with the fact that, according to the *imāmis*, 'Ali was the *imām* after the Prophet⁵. Naturally, Ibn Rūzbihān maintains that the successor to the Prophet was Abū Bakr not through any textual direction but through unanimity (*iğmā'*)⁶. Qādi Nūr Allāh steps in to bring all the possible evidence he can muster in order to vindicate the statement made by Ibn al-Muṭahhar⁷.

Ibn al-Muṭahhar then goes on to quote from the Qur'ān those verses which the *imāmis* believe were intended to refer to 'Ali or his succession or the succession of the various members of the Prophet's family⁸. Each one of these verses is in turn discussed by Ibn Rūzbihān who gives the Sunni interpretation of their intent, and then each one is subsequently confirmed by Qādi Nūr Allāh in accordance with *iṣnā'aṣārī* beliefs.

3. Ibn Taimiya and the Nuṣairis

Earlier in this chapter we saw Ibn Taimiya's views on *iṣnā'aṣārī* *Si'i* writings exemplified by his refutation of Ibn al-Muṭahhar al-Hilli's *Minhāj al-karāma*. What follows is another specimen of polemical writing this time reviewed in Ibn Taimiya's attack against the Nuṣairis,

¹ Which even in English defies translation!

² Sūstarī, *Iḥqāq*, II, 334.

³ *Ibid.*, II, 336.

⁴ *Ibid.*, II, 341–44. "I have seen", says Qādi Nūr Allāh, "on the cover of a copy of this ill-starred work, and in the handwriting of one of the *qādis* of Māwarā'annahr, a few lines of exaggerated praise of this book and its author." – The text of two poems by Ḥungī, one in Persian and the other in Turkish, sent from Māwarā'annahr to Sultan Selim urging him to attack Shāh Ismā'il, is preserved in Feridūn, *Munṣa'at*, I, 367. See also *Iḥqāq*, II, Introduction, 59–63. In them he addresses the Ottoman Sultan as: «مهلی آنر الزبان».

⁵ Sūstarī, *Iḥqāq*, II, 355.

⁶ *Ibid.*, II, 356.

⁷ The commentator of *Iḥqāq* at this point comes to his assistance and quotes several other sources which Qādi Nūr Allāh had left out. *Iḥqāq*, II, 358–399.

⁸ Eighty-four of these verses are given, which, together with extensive comments on them, occupy the remainder of Volume II (p. 399 ff.) of the *Iḥqāq*, and fill all of Volume III of the work.

a group of extreme Šī'is whose ideas derived in some form or other from the Fātimids of Egypt and from the earlier Qarmātians.

The question was put to Ibn Taimiya to give his opinion on the Nuṣairis by a Šāfi'i šāfiḥ: "What do the *imāms* of religion say about: the Nuṣairis who believe in the drinking of wine, in re-incarnation of the soul, the ancientness of the world . . . and that their God who created the heavens and the earth is 'Ali ibn Abi Ṭālib . . . who to them is the *imām* in heaven and the *imām* on earth . . . and who say that Muḥammad (the Prophet) is the name while 'Ali is the meaning and essence? . . . This accursed sect has occupied a large section of Syria, and are notorious and well-known and exercise their religion openly. Their affairs were unknown to most people during the occupation of the coastal lands by the vanquished Crusades; but when Islām returned they were uncovered . . ."¹

Ibn Taimiya replies by a general condemnation of the Nuṣairis and other sects that hold similar views. "These people", he says, "who are called the Nuṣairis, together with all kinds of *bājīni* Qarmātians, are more godless and akin to atheism (*kufr*) than the Jews and Christians, and are in fact more disbelieving than many idolators (*mušrikūn*). Their harm against the Muslim community is greater than the harm of the fighting atheists like the Tatars (read Mongols), Crusaders, and others".

Ibn Taimiya concurs with the questioner on the matter of collusion between the Nuṣairis and the Crusaders. "It is known to us," he says, "that the Syrian coastlands fell into the hands of the Christians only through them, for they always took the side of every enemy of the Muslims".²

Then he turns to a topic which had become his pet subject, namely that the Mongols could never have entered the lands of Islam and killed the Caliph of Bağdād and other Muslim kings except through the assistance and support of such sects³. Naṣir ad-Din Ṭūsi is then singled out for attack, and Ibn Taimiya also brings in the Ismā'ilis of Alamūt: "Their allegiance was to the person who was their vizir, i. e. al-Naṣir at-Ṭūsi. He was their minister at Alamūt, and it was he who ordered the execution of the Caliph and the succession of the Tatars (read Mongols). They have names well-known to the Muslims: at times they are known as the *malāhida*, at other times the *qarāmiṭa* or the *bājīnis* or the Ismā'ilis or the Nuṣairis . . . Some of these names are applied to all of them or are specific only to some of their sects."⁴

Ibn Taimiya then attacks some of their "philosophical" views and refers to the activities of İhwān aş-Şafā. "They maintain", he states "that the first thing that God created was the mind. By saying that they agree with the statements of the philosophers, the followers of Aristotle . . . They misinterpret and misapply the sayings of the Prophet like the authors of the treatises of the Brethren of Purity and similar groups".⁵

This violent attack on the Nuṣairis⁶ is more vociferous than Ibn Taimiya's refutations of the views of the *imāmī* Twelver Ibn al-Muṭahhar. For these groups which he is now dealing with hold extreme views which are detested by all members of the Muslim community – Sunnis as well as Šī'is. Moreover, the involvement of these groups with the remnants of the Crusades in Syria made them an easy prey to Ibn Taimiya's wrath.

¹ Ibn Taimiya, *Maqṣū' ar-rasd'i*, 94–95. The treatise in question is entitled: "Risāla ft r-radd 'alā an-Nuṣairiya", pp. 94–102.

² *Ibid.*, 96.

³ *Ibid.*, 97.

⁴ *Ibid.*, The reference here no doubt is to the *iqnā'asari* Šī'is.

⁵ *Ibid.*, 97–98.

⁶ *Ibid.*, 98.

⁷ Which goes on to mention specific things asked in the question, viz. marriage with them, partaking of their food, allowing them to guard the frontiers of Islam, etc.

Ibn Battūta, the famous traveler, who was passing in this area about this time makes more specific observations on the Nuṣairis. He says: "Most of the inhabitants of these coastlands belong to the Nuṣairi sect who believe that 'Ali ibn Abi Tālib is a god, and they do not pray, nor do they perform ablutions or observe the fast. Al-Malik az-Zāhir (Baibars, who reigned: 658-676/1260-1277) had forced them to build mosques in their villages. They did build a mosque in every village away from the inhabited sections, which they never went into or repaired. Sometimes, their cattle and beasts of burden would find shelter in these mosques. Sometimes a stranger would come to the town and would stay at the mosque and chant the call to prayer. They would answer: Stop braying! Your fodder shall be sent to you! Their numbers were great"¹.

The famous traveler goes on to narrate a story about a stranger who came to the lands of the Nuṣairis and claimed that he was the Mahdi. This character fooled the apparently simple people sending them to conquer the lands of the Muslims with sticks which he told them will change into swords when the fighting begins. The governors of the neighboring districts joined hands to put an end to this insurrection. The news had reached Cairo, and al-Malik an-Nāṣir was about to decide to exterminate the entire community were it not for his chief minister who called his attention to the fact that the Nuṣairis were needed to till the lands².

To conclude this discussion of Ibn Taimiya's attacks on the non-Sunni Muslim groups, it might perhaps be useful to give one example of what were his own beliefs about religion. In a short treatise entitled '*Aqīdat Aḥl as-Sunnah wal-Firqa an-Nāṣīyah*', addressed from Ahmad ibn Taimiya to whomsoever this message reaches among those Muslims who adhere to the Sunna and the community, he says: "God's religion is the middle path between exaggerated zeal and negligence. For whenever God commands the people to perform a thing Satan opposes it in two ways, unconcerned in which of the two he will succeed: either making (the people) go to extremes (in performing God's command) or having them forsake it altogether"³.

4. Nāṣir ad-Dīn al-Baīḍāwī

We shall conclude by devoting a few short words to the fourth of the scholars whom we took to represent the religious climate during the high Mongol period, i. e., the Shāfi'i judge of Tabriz, Nāṣir ad-Dīn 'Abd Allāh ibn 'Umar al-Baīḍāwī (d. 685/1286).

Baīḍāwī was born at Baīḍā, a small town to the south of Shīrāz. Later he became chief judge in Shīrāz and spent his last days in Tabriz where he died⁴.

He is best remembered for his work on Qur'ānic interpretation and exegesis, the *Anwār at-tanzil*⁵. He belonged to the Shāfi'i school and adhered to the views of Abū l-Hasan al-Āsh'arī

¹ Ibn Battūta, *Rihla*, 79-80/Gibb's transl. I, 111-112.

² *Ibid.* al-Malik an-Nāṣir is most probably the Mamlūk Sultān an-Nāṣir Muḥammad who ruled 693-694/1293-94; 698-708/1298-1308; and 709-741/1309-1340.

³ Ibn Taimiya, '*Aqīdat aḥl as-Sunnah . . .*', ed. 'Abd ar-Rāziq 'Arīfī, Cairo 1358/1939.

⁴ Ibn Taimiya, *Ibid.*, p. 22: وَرَدْ تَقْتُمْ أَنَّ دِينَ اللَّهِ وَسْطَ بَيْنَ الْفَالِ فِي وَالْجَانِ مِنْهُ . . . وَاقِعٌ مَا أَمْرٌ مَبَادِهِ بِأَمْرٍ أَلَا اعْتَرَضُ: الشَّيْطَانُ فِيهِ بِأَمْرِنِ لَا يَبَالُ بِأَيْمَانِهِ ظَفَرٌ: أَمَا افْرَاطُ فِيهِ وَأَمَا تَفْرِطُ فِيهِ.

For an exposition of the beliefs of the Sunni schools (of the Ḥanafī rite), see the early work of almost the same title ('*Aqīdat aḥl as-Sunnah wal-Ğamđ'a*) by Abū Ġa'far Ahmad at-Tahāwī (d. 321/933), translated into English by E. E. ELDER in *The Macdonald Presentation Volume* (Princeton University Press, 1933), 129-144. at-Tahāwī was the great Ḥanafī lawyer of Egypt and a contemporary of al-Āsh'arī.

⁵ *Nāma-yi Dānišwārān-i Nāṣiri*, VIII, 136-151, and as-Subkī *Tabaqāt as-Shāfi'iyya*, V, 59. Subkī, who belongs to the generation after Baīḍāwī, praises Baīḍāwī's knowledge and tells a story about how he impressed an audience in Tabriz by his erudition.

⁶ The work was presented to Argūn-hān (683-690/1284-91), who was pleased with the work and rewarded Baīḍāwī by appointing him *qādī* of Baīḍā at his request. *Nāma-yi Dānišwārān*, VIII, 139.

on *kalām*. His work on the Qur'ān seems to have acquired great renown after his death. A writer of the succeeding generation states that Baiḍāwī's work "spread in the lands and was communicated far and wide; many great *imāms* graduated when they studied it¹".

Two recent scholars who have studied and translated certain sections of Baiḍāwī's *Anwār* have this to say on his methods of interpretation: "al-Baidāwī . . . seems accredited as the commentator *par excellence* of the Qur'ān . . . He is a scholar who earns respect for the beginnings of a sifting of evidence, while in some instance he wisely leaves his readers to choose their own interpretation of certain passages²".

This latitudinarian approach to Qur'ānic interpretation has made even the Ši'is accept certain views put forth by Baiḍāwī as we have seen³. BROCKELMANN lists as many as eighty-six glosses on Baiḍāwī's *tafsīr*⁴.

The importance of Baiḍāwī has in fact been already recognized by orientalists⁵, as well as by one of the chief centers of Islamic studies, al-Azhar university in Cairo⁶.

Baiḍāwī is also known, but to a much lesser degree, as the author in Persian of a short history called *Nizām at-tawāriḥ* which covers the period from the creation to the year 674/1275⁷. The work was translated and used by 'Abd Allāh ibn Fath Allāh al-Bagdādī in his fifteenth century chronicle *at-Tārīħ al-Giyāħ*⁸. Even the great Persian contemporary poet Ḥāfiẓ, we are told, used to read some of the works of Baiḍāwī⁹.

5. Conclusion

To recapitulate: we have reviewed briefly some of the works of four representative scholars whose life coincided with the Mongol Ilhānid domination in the Muslim world. We have reviewed one of Naṣir ad-Dīn Ṭūsī's minor works on *imāma* and commented on his involvement with the coming of the Mongols, the fall of Bagdād, and the controversy about his *Ismā'īlī*-sevener and *iṭnā'ašarī*-twelver views. We then discussed the great controversies between the leading Twelver scholar Ibn al-Muṭahhar al-Ḥilli with two of his most famous opponents: the great

¹ Abū Muḥammad 'Abd Allāh ibn As'ad al-Yāfi'I (d. 768/1366), *Mir'āt al-ġinān wa-'ibrat al-yaqūdān*, (Hyderabad, 1339/1920), IV, 220.

² E. F. F. BISHOP and Moh. KADDAL, *Chrestomathia Baidawiana: The Light of Inspiration and Secret of Interpretation* (translation of Sūrat Yūsuf), Glasgow, 1957 p. 7.

³ See above, p. 34, and Şüstarlı, *İħqāq*, II, 307. See also Ḥwānsārlı, *Rauḍat al-ġannāt*, where the author talks of Baiḍāwī's طریقة الیاطن و ادراکه اللب الواقعه، According to Ḥasan-i Fasā'l, *Fārsnāma-yi Naṣiri*, Pt. 2, 183–84. Baiḍāwī studied with Naṣir ad-Dīn Ṭūsī.

⁴ GAL, I, 416–418.

⁵ Baiḍāwī's commentary was edited by H. O. FLEISCHER as *Baidawii Commentarius in Coranum* in 2 volumes (Leipzig 1846–48). A volume of *Indices* appeared in 1879, prepared by W. FELL. For a view on Baiḍāwī's work by Th. NÖLDEKE, see *Geschichte des Qorans*, II, "Die Sammlung des Qorans", Leipzig 1919, 176–77. D. S. MARGOLIOUTH, in the last decade of the 19th century, translated Sūra iii (Āl 'Imrān) for use by the students of the Oxford Oriental School. See his *Chrestomathia Baidawiana*, London 1894.

⁶ The Cairo edition of *Anwār al-tanzzīl* (4 parts in 2 volumes, 1330/1911), with the commentary of al-Ḥaṭīb al-Kāzarūnlı, is prescribed for the 6th year students at al-Azhar University in Cairo; see J. ROBSON, "al-Bayḍāwī", in *EI*, new edition.

⁷ On Baiḍāwī's *Nizām at-tawāriħ*, see 'Azzāwī, *at-Ta'rīf bi-al-mu'arriħiñ*, 116–119, ETHÉ, *Cat. of the Pers. MSS.*, I, No. 16, col. 7, RILU, *Pers. Cat.*, 832–34, and BROWNE, *LHP*, III, 63 and 100–101. The section on China in Baiḍāwī's history was published in German in the last quarter of the 17th century. – Baiḍāwī writes in a rather neutral way about the Ismā'īlīs of Alamūt. He ascribes no offensive teachings to the first two (Ḥasan-i Ṣabbāh and Kiyā Buzurg Umid), but does talk about the *ta'wilat-i bājil* of the Qur'an by their successors. See his *Niğām at-tawāriħ*, ed. Bahman Mirzā KARIMI, (Tehran 1313), 82–84.

⁸ 'Abd Allāh ibn Fath Allāh al-Bagdādī, *at-Tārīħ al-Giyāħ*, MS., p. 5.

⁹ Browne, *LHP*, III, 272.

contemporary Hanbali writer Ibn Taimiya, and the equally celebrated Sunni Aš'arite thinker Faḍl Allāh ibn Rūzbihān Ḥunḍī of the late fifteenth century. We also had a quick look into Ibn Taimiya's attack on the Nuṣairis who represented an extremist (*gulāt*) view of Šī'ism. And finally we included a few passing remarks on that great Qur'ān interpreter Baidāwī who at that time and place could write one of the best known interpretations of the Holy Book.

This quick exposition seems to indicate very clearly that the Mongol period (i. e., the first three-quarters of a century or so of the period under discussion) was marked with tremendous religious controversies; but at the same time it was a period of co-existence of the various Muslim religious views. This co-existence amounted almost to a freedom of religious beliefs and reciprocal toleration¹. Increasing signs, however, were slowly pointing the way to a predominance of the *iḥnā ašārī* beliefs in the higher circles of the court and in the cities². This appeared clearly in the attempts of Ulḡaitū to dabble with the various schools. The Mongol *sultāns*, by and large, seem to have been playing the part of innocent bystanders; but their attitude, however, could not be described as that of a-plague-on-both-your-houses. Rather they showed interest in and appreciation of the lively controversies. But they remained essentially foreign to what was going on along the religious level. Their men kept the peace.

As far as their religious duties were concerned, the early Mongol *hāns* entrusted the conduct of religious endowments (*waqfs*) to the only person who was capable enough to run them efficiently, i. e. Naṣir ad-Din Ṭūsī³, on whom they appear to have counted in various other matters such as finance⁴. Later Mongol *sultāns* increased *waqf* lands in an attempt to improve

¹ On this see the interesting remarks of Manūcihr MURTAŻAWI, pp. 74–80 of his article "Dīn-o-maqhab dar 'ahd-i Ilbāniyān", mentioned in footnote 1 p. 22 above, and Čawād SAĞCĀDİYA, وَبِوَدْنَ تَعَصُّبَ مُلْمِهِ در دوره in *Nāṣriya-yi Dāniškada-yi Adabīyāt*, XI (Tabriz 1338/1959), pp. 151–159. Cf. 'Umari, *Masālik*, (Klaus LECH, *Das Mongolische Weltreich*), p. 10 where it is stated that:

وَمِنْ قَوَانِيمِهِمْ أَنَّ الْفَتَنَ مِنْهُمْ لَا يَتَصَبَّرُونَ لِذَهَابِ مَلَكَتِهِمْ .

² Quoting from Hāfiẓ-i Abrū's *Maqma' at-tawāriḥ* (Tehran, Malik Library MS.) on Gāzān-hān's inclination (*lamāyul*) towards Šī'ism, Manūcihr MURTAŻAWI says:

وَ... بِادْشَاهِ فَازَانْ خَانَ رَا مِيلَ تَامَ بَدَانْ طَالِبَهُ بِرُودَيِّ. أَنَّا هُرَّ كَزَ ازْ غَایَتْ كَنَابَتْ اظْهَارَ نَكْرَدِيِّ وَرَمَاتِ مَصْلَحَتْ هَامَ فَرَمَدِيِّ، وَكُنَّ رَا زَهَرَةَ آنَكَ اظْهَارَ كَنَّ بِرُودَيِّ .

See his article "Dīn-o-maqhab dar ahd-i Ilbāniyān", p. 45. 'Abbas AL-'Azzāwī, in his *Tārīkh an-nuqūd al-'Irāqīya*, p. 54, argues that the Mongols under Ulḡaitū established Šī'ism as a reaction to the sunnī caliphate which they had supplanted, but that this attempt failed and they had to revert to traditional sunnism.

* Bar-Hebraeus, *Muqtasār ad-duwal* (Beirut, ed., 1890), 500–1, and BROWNE, *LHP*, III, 18. Ibn Faḍl Allāh al-'Umari in *Masālik al-abṣar* inquired about *waqf* lands under the Mongols:

وَسَأَلَتْ... إِنْ كَانَتِ الْأَرْقَافُ بِأَيِّهِ فِي نَوْاحِي هَذِهِ الْمُلْكَةِ (أَيْ عَلَكَةِ الْإِيَّلْخَانِيَّنِ) كَمْ عَلَيْهَا إِلَآنٌ أَمْ تَنَوَّلَتْهَا أَيْدِي السُّرْوَانِ، فَأَسْبَرَتِيْ بِأَنَّهَا جِبِيَا جَارِيَةً فِي مَجَارِيهَا لَمْ يَتَرَضَّ الْبَهَا مَتَّعْرِضَ لَا فِي دُولَةِ هُولَكُورِ وَلَا فِي مَا بَدَهَا بِلْ كُلَّ وَقْتٍ فِي يَدِ سُرْلَيْهِ وَمِنْ لِهِ الْوَلَايَةِ عَلَيْهِ، وَكُلَّ مَا يَقَالُ مِنْ نَفْسِ حَالِ الْأَرْقَافِ بِأَيِّرَانِ جِبِيَا هُوَ مِنْ سُوْلَةِ أَمْرَهَا أَكْثَرُ مِنْ سَوْمَهِ .

See 'Azzāwī, *Tārīkh*, III, Appendix 2, p. 39; and see now original text of 'Umari's *Masālik* (in Klaus LECH, *Das Mongolische Weltreich*), p. 92 of the Arabic text; and the comments on *Waqf*-lands by Klaus LECH, pp. 332–333 of the German section. For a description of Ṭūsī's performance in this respect, see Ibn al-Fūṭi/Fuwati?, (d. 723/1323–24), *al-Hawādīq al-ğāmi'a*, (Bağdād, 1351/1932) p. 375. *Waqf*-lands remained under the supervision of Ṭūsī and his sons until the year 687/1288–89, when they reverted to the governors of Bağdād.

* Muqtābā MINOVİ and V. MINORSKY, "Naṣir ad-Din Ṭūsī on Finance", *BSOAS*, X (1940–42), 755–789 – a treatise written perhaps for Hulagu to familiarize the foreign ruler with taxation in the newly conquered lands.

their relations with the Muslim clergy¹. Their primary interest, however, seems to have been directed to encouraging astronomy and the historical sciences².

On many occasions, the Ilhānid sultāns assumed the role of patron or intermediary. Gāzān-hān (694-703/1295-1304), for example, while touring the ſī'i shrines at Karbalā, made several endowments to darwīsh monasteries, to Šāfi'i and Ḥanafī colleges, and established a resident for sayyids³. Earlier, Ahmad Takudār (680-683/1281-84) conducted lengthy correspondence with the Mamlūk Sultān Qalawūn of Egypt on religious questions⁴. Ulḡaitū, before giving weight to the *iqnā'ašarī ſī'is*, had at one time ordered the execution of a Kurd who claimed to be the Mahdi, and an extreme Šī'i missionary who attempted to convert him⁵.

The Mongol chief minister and most influential person in the Mongol court, Rašid ad-Dīn Faḍl Allāh, apparently tried to steer a clear course amid these religious controversies: once he saved two Šāfi'i scholars of Baġdād who were accused of treasonable activity with Egypt, and on another occasion he was instrumental in the execution of the *naqib al-ašraf* (chief representative of the family of the Prophet)⁶. His own orthodoxy seems to have been secure⁷.

The Ismā'iliyah of Alāmuṭ, on the other hand, although their fortresses had been destroyed, seem to have continued some kind of commando activity directed (as was the case during the Fātimid regime) by the Mamlūk rulers of Egypt. Ibn Baṭṭūṭa, passing through their strongholds in Syria, has the following description of this phase of Ismā'ili activity: "These fortresses belong to a sect called the Ismā'iliyah. They are also known by the name of *fidāwīs* (commandos: persons who sacrifice their lives for a cause) . . . They are the arrows of the (Egyptian Mamlūk Sultān) al-Malik al-Nāṣir, with which he strikes at his enemies whom he cannot reach in Iraq and other countries. They have salaries . . ."⁸

¹ A. A. ALI-ZADE, "The agrarian system in Azerbaijan in the XIII-XIV centuries", *Aktos des vierundzwanzigsten Orientalisten-Kongresses*, (München, 28 August - 4 September 1957), ed. H. Franke, Wiesbaden, 1959, p. 340.

² Muḥammad MU'IN, *Hāfiẓ-i Šīrīn suhan* (Tehran 1319), section on "Ulūm-o-adabiyāt dar 'aṣr-i Hāfiẓ", pp. 52 ff.; Ṭūsī at Marāgā, and the historians Ġuwāīnī and Rašid ad-Dīn.

³ BROWNE, *LHP*, III, 42, 44, and 46.

⁴ *Ibid.*, III, 25-26. For specimens of this correspondence see H. H. HOWORTH, *History of the Mongols*, Part III, "The Mongols of Persia" (London 1888), 290 ff.; G. D'OHSSON, *Histoire des Mongols depuis Tchinguiz-khan*, v. III (The Hague 1834), 563 ff.; HAMMER-PURGSTALL, *Geschichte der Ilchane*, v. I (Darmstadt 1842), 331 ff. (based on *Tārih-i Waṣṣaf*; see edition by HAMMER-PURGSTALL, *Geschichte Wassaf's* (Wien 1856), v. I, 231 ff. (of the Persian text), and the Bombay edition (1249/1833, reprinted in 1338/1960), 113 ff.); and Maqrīzī, *Sulūk*, I, pt. 3, Annex 7, pp. 977-984 (other Mongol-Mamlūk correspondence in Annexes 12-16.)

⁵ BROWNE, *LHP*, III, 50-51.

⁶ *Ibid.*, III, 70-71.

⁷ "A MS. containing the Persian translation of Rašid ad-Dīn's *Lajd'if al-haqd'iq* . . . contains two copies of an attestation of the orthodoxy of Rašid ad-Dīn's theological views signed by seventy leading doctors of Muslim theology. This attestation was drawn up in consequence of an accusation of heterodoxy made against Rašid ad-Dīn by a malicious fellow . . ." See BROWNE, *LHP*, III, 76.

⁸ Ibn Baṭṭūṭa, *Rihla*, 76, and 77-78/GIBB's transl., I, 106 ff. -al-Malik an-Nāṣir Muḥammad ibn Qalawūn sent in 720/1320 thirty assassins from Syria to Irān. Sultān Abu Sa'īd was frightened and hid in his tent. Amir Čubān told an-Nāṣir's envoy:

وَيُلِكَ أَنْتَ كُلَّ قَلِيلٍ تَخْضُرُ إِلَيْنَا هَدِيَّةً وَزِيَادَةً مَا أَنْ تَكُونَ مُتَقْبِينَ مَعَ صَاحِبِ الْمَسْرُورَ لِتَكْرِهَنَا الْفَدَارِيَّةَ وَالْإِسَاعِلِيَّةَ.

al-Maqrīzī, *Sulūk*, v. II, pt. 1, p. 207. In the peace treaty which was shortly concluded Abu Sa'īd inserted as one of the terms that no Ismā'iliyah were to enter Mongol territory. For the peace treaty see al-Maqrīzī, loc. cit., 209-210. On all this see Muḥammad Čamāl ad-Dīn SURŪR, *Daulat Bani Qalawūn fi Miṣr* (Cairo 1947), 206 ff., and Cf. 'Azzāwī, *Tārih*, I, 470-71.

At times, the Mamlūks attempted to curb Ismā'ili activity: Abū l-Fidā, *Kitāb al-muhtasar*, IV, 76, when as *amīr* of Ḥamā he was instructed:

وَأَنْ لَا تَكُونَ بَحَثًا وَبِلَادَهَا حَاجَةً لِلْمُرْءَةِ الْإِسَاعِلِيَّةِ.

In fact, the Ismā'īlis of Alamūt are said to have regained control of their fortress towns for some time, and it required another Mongol expedition to dislodge them¹. A leading scholar of Ismā'īli history and thought made the following appraisal of the influence of Ismā'īlism after the fall of Alamūt: "The rapid spread of Shi'ism after the Mongol invasion and the destruction of the political power of the Ismā'īlis may perhaps be attributed to a large extent to the drifting of the Ismā'īli communities under the shelter of the kindred sects which gained influence at that time"².

iṭnā'aṣāri Šī'ism, on the other hand, showed definite signs of prosperity particularly during the reigns of Gāzān-hān and Ulḡaitū. The other two main branches of Šī'ism, namely Ismā'īlism and the *gūlāt*, did not fare so well. As a Muslim school with a recognized set of principles and a highly elaborate system of dogma, *iṭnā'aṣāri Šī'ism* could be applied side by side with an established system of government like that under the Ilhānids. (In fact, so was the Ismā'īli system under the Fātimids in Egypt in an earlier century). The later Ismā'īli (*fidāwī*) successors to the Alamūt regime, as well as such splinter groups as the Nuṣairī *gūlāt*, had no place in an organized and well-established regime.

However, the victory of *iṭnā'aṣāri Šī'ism* was short-lived, and the Mongols under Abū Sa'id (and even already under the last few years of Ulḡaitū) reverted to the Sunni synthesis. At least this was so officially and formally; for in fact, the *iṭnā'aṣāriya* persisted under some of the Mongol successor states such as the Čubānids and the Galāyirs.

Šī'i scholars carried on the struggle of winning over the central government (any central government – for after the Ilhānids the use of the term becomes rather academic) to *iṭnā'aṣāri Šī'ism* in the second and third generations after Ibn al-Muṭahhar. Muḥammad ibn Makki al-'Āmili, "aš-Sahid al-Awwal" (put to death in 786/1384), and Ahmad ibn Fahd al-Hilli (d. 841/1437) are two such leading scholars. But by their time the approach had become slightly altered. Ibn Makki's involvements, for example, were with the *gūlāt* dynasty of the Sarbadārs; while Ibn Fahd showed signs of intimacy with both the *gūlāt* and with Šūfism. Two of his more celebrated students were Muḥammad ibn Falāh who founded the extreme ſī'i state of the Muša'šā' in the marshlands of southern Iraq, and Muḥammad Nūrbahš, the founder of the Nūrbahšiya ſūfi order in eastern Irān.

To say that *iṭnā'aṣāri Šī'ism* dissipated its strength and found temporary refuge among the ſūfi orders and extreme ſī'i movements of the 14th and 15th centuries is to deny the *iṭnā'aṣāri* scholars and divines their continued interest and keen concern with the long and elaborate tradition which goes back many centuries. Perhaps it is more correct to say that the ſūfi orders as well as the *gūlāt* stole the show and used Šī'ism, in its more popular and folk-Islamic garbs, for their own purposes. This is perhaps the truer picture; and it can best be seen through a study of one of these ſūfi orders, that of Šaih Ṣafi ad-Din of Ardabil, the eponymous founder of the Šafawids.

The allegiance of the Ismā'īllis to the Mamlūk sultāns of Egypt (who were sunnis) is very curious, and the following remark from Qalqašandī (originally from al-'Umari) is worth quoting:

ورقة ذكر (السرى) في مالك الأنصار نقلًا عن مقدمتهم مبارك بن مطران أن كل من ملك مصر كان مظهراً لهم. ولذلك يرون انتلاف نقوصهم في طاعته لما ينتظرون إليه من التعميم الأكبر في زعيمهم. ورأيت نحو ذلك في أساس السياسة لابن ظافر. وذكر أئمّة يرون أن ملوك مصر كالزواب لأنّهم لقياً لهم مقاومهم».

Qalqašandī, *Šubḥ al-aṣā*, XIII, p. 245. – In view of all this post-Alamūt activity of the Ismā'īllis/*fiddawīs*, it is difficult to accept B. Lewis' statement that "it (Šī'ism of the Ismā'īli type) dragged on an attenuated and fossilised existence." See his "Some observations on the significance of heresy in the history of Islam", *Studia Islamica*, I (1953), 43–63. The quotation given here is from p. 50.

¹ BROWNE, *LHP*, III, 25. An assassin attempt to kill Tīmūr in Damascus was made as late as 1400. *Ibid.*, III, 197.

² W. IVANOW, *An Ismailitic Work . . .*, JRAS (1931), p. 529, n. 1.

THE SŪFI ORDER AT ARDABIL

An attempt has been made in the preceding chapter to examine the religious state of affairs as it manifested itself among some of the learned Muslim scholars at the Mongol Ilhānid court and, in certain cases (like that of Ibn Taimiya), the reaction to this – again at the high level of the theologians and scholars – at the Mamlūk state and in particular in Syria. The persons dealt with represented the truly cultured classes of society and belonged to what may conveniently be referred to as the world of "high Islam". These were persons, like Naṣir ad-Din Ṭūsi and Ibn al-Muṭahhar al-Hilli, or Ibn Taimiya and al-Baīdāwī, who were steeped in religious knowledge, and who either considered themselves as the religious leaders of their communities or were recognized as such by their followers, or accepted it as a religious duty to make their views known on certain important and controversial religious problems like the succession to the Prophet, or the *imāma*, or the true *imām*, or his infallibility, to mention only a few of the matters which were the subject of contention – extending all the way from the proper and correct understanding of a grammatical-textual point (a matter of serious consideration when the significance of every word and letter of the *Qur'ān* is concerned) to such vital issues as the whole question of the createdness or otherwise of the word of God.

Such matters however were by their very nature the domain of the few – the learned, the scholarly, the students of religion, the masters and their devoted followers. Very rarely did such questions go beyond this rather small circle of religious elite. If they did, the farthest they went was to the *imām* in the local mosque or to the muezzin in the minaret. It was only then that the common man of the cities, towns, and villages – and again, only the man who cared to show interest in such matters – knew about what was going on. And he knew only the general, the broad outline, the end result. This situation is perhaps best exemplified in a comment by JUYNBOLL with reference to the *šī'i adān* formula *hayya 'alā hair al-'amal*: "These words have at all times been the shibboleth of the Shi'ites; when called out from the minarets in an Orthodox country, the inhabitants knew that the government had become Shi'ite."¹

That may have been the end of things. Often, however, it was the beginning of problems which manifested themselves in attempts at civil insurrections or even massacres of *šī'is* by *sunnis* or the other way around. Such strife was often instigated by the people in power, the local governor or the chief in the town, usually egged on by the religious divines whose interests appeared nearly always to coincide with that of the ruling power, or whose own selfish ambitions had been jeopardized². The *šī'i* groups, almost always in the minority, feigned

¹ Th. W. JUYNBOLL, "Adhān", *EI*, new edition (article reproduced verbatim from the first edition).

² Cf. V. MINORSKY in *Unity and Variety*, 190–91, "... from the Seljūq time on we confront: the official religion tied closely to the interests of the rulers, the Shi'ite opposition associated with numerous movements directed against the established order, and artificial ways of evasion in which the frustration of generations that live in a dead-end age takes refuge".

religious dissimulation (*taqīya*)¹ – an attitude which became part of their religious tenets, and in this way they saved themselves from their enemies.

But this was something temporary and occasional. One may even say it was not the rule, rather the exception to the rule². As a policy of the state, we shall have reason to refer to the situation in Anatolia and the *Şī'i* revolts there in the fifteenth century in a later section. Suffice it to say at present that the religious controversies which we have dealt with in the preceding chapter were fought by and large among the religious scholars themselves, by refutation and counter-refutation, and at the court of the ruling princes, by argument and discussion. The common man was hardly aware of what exactly was going on.

In fact, there was something else that was drawing the common man away from the controversial arguments of the scholars, something which sounded more understandable to him, something that had less to do with dogmatic beliefs and more with the real wonders of his life. For around him, in almost every town and city there was a "holy man", a Şüfi saint, who could perform miracles or do actions which to the common man appeared truly amazing. This saint was attracting the common people away from the difficult and exacting problems of Islam the religion and, through local meetings, gatherings, repetitive prayers, simple monotonous singing, and even mass hysteria, the pious saint won those people's hearts with the promise of attaining the final stage of communion with God in a state of utter and supreme ecstasy³.

The whole question of Şüfism or mysticism during the Mongol period has not been studied in full, and our knowledge about folk Islam during this period and afterwards is very sketchy. Conclusions on this matter, therefore, will be very difficult to draw definitively. However, a look into the life and times of one of the most famous Şüfi orders of the time will, it is to be hoped, lead to a better understanding of the problem as a whole.

To such a Şüfi saint we will now direct our attention. He is important for our purposes; for his descendants, less than two centuries after his death, made of Irān a unified state and

¹ On *taqīya* see a very informative article by R. STROTHMANN in the *Shorter Encyclopaedia of Islam*, (Leiden 1953), s. v. "Taqīya".

² On the massacres in Iṣfahān for example see Ibn Baṭṭūṭa, *Risāla*, 199 ff./ GIBB's transl. II, 294–95.

³ Theologians were unable to stop such mass movements, and the rulers "were outwardly respectful to the 'Ulamā, but positively humble before the Şüff Shaikhs", H. A. R. GIBB, *Mohammedanism: an historical survey*, (Home University Library, 2nd ed., 1953, repr. 1954), p. 144. And who would listen to Sa'd ad-Dīn Taftazānī (d. 792 or 798/1389 or 1395) for example when he says in his *Risāla fi waḥdat al-wujūd* (Istanbul, 1294/1877), p. 31:

وَبِالجُلْسَةِ كُلُّ درجةٍ وَرَتْبَةٍ لِلأَرْوَاحِ، فَكَالَّا لَهَا لِلَّذِيَّاءِ، لَا كَمَرْعَةٌ أَجْهَلَةٌ مِنَ الْمُتَصْفَقَةِ أَنَّ الرَّوْلَيْ أَفْسَلَ مِنَ النَّبِيِّ.

Cf. contemporary views on Şüfism by Ibn Taimīya in his *fatwā*: *as-Şüfīya wal-suqarā'* (Cairo 1327/1909), 15–16, and in his *al-Furqān bain auliyyā' ar-Rahmān wa-auliyyā' as-Sai'dīn* (Cairo 1374/1955), p. 86. Apparently Naṣr ad-Dīn Ṭūfī did not think highly of certain types of Şüfis or darwishes. Witness the following anecdote in Ibn al-Fūtī's *Hawḍīf*, 342 (events of the year 658/1259–60):

شُكِّي أَنَّ السُّلْطَانَ (هُولَاكُو) لَمْ كَانْ يَوْطَأَ حَرَانَ، وَقَفَ لَهُ جَمِيعُ الْفَقَرَاءِ الْقَلِيلَرَأْيَةِ، فَقَالَ لِصَبَرِ الدِّينِ طَوْبِيِّ: مَا هُولَاكُو؟ قَالَ: فَضَلَّ فِي الْعَالَمِ. فَأَسَرَّ بِقَتْلِهِمْ فَقَتُلُوا. وَسَالَهُ عَنْ مَنْ قُولَهُ فَقَالَ: النَّاسُ أُوْبِعُ طَبَقَاتٍ بَيْنَ إِمَارَةٍ وَتِجَارَةٍ وَسَنَامَةٍ وَزَرَاعَةٍ، فَلَمْ يَكُنْ مِنْهُمْ كَانَ كَلَّا عَلَيْهِمْ. (الْكُلُّ مَعْنَاهُ الشَّقِيلُ لَا خَيْرُ فِيهِ).

Cf. Ibn Haldūn's views on the composition of Şüfi science ('ilm) in his *Sīfā' as-sā'i li-tahqīb al-masā'i* (Istanbul 1957), 70–71. And for a discussion of *taṣawwuf* see Ġāmī's own introduction to his *Nafḥāt al-uns* (Tehran 1336/1958, ed. Mahdi Tauhīdī-pūr), pp. 3–30; and Ġāmī's treatise on Şüfism, the *Lauḍā'ih*, facsimile edition with translation by E. H. WHINEFIELD and Muhammad QAZWĪNī, London, Royal Asiatic Society, 1928.

established in it the *iqnā'ašāri* type of Muslim *Sī'ism*. This was Šaih Ṣafī ad-Dīn of Ardabil¹.

Chronologically, the earlier part of the history of the Order of Ardabil covers both the Mongol and Timūrid sections of this study, and ends roughly around the middle of the fifteenth century. The remaining fifty years of the century coincide with the later activity of the Order under the Qara-qoyunlu and Aq-qoyunlu dynasties.

However, no purpose will be served by going into the details of the biographies of the scions of the Ṣafawid family (although these have still to be definitively written). Rather than do that, we shall study the major characteristics of the Order itself as shown by its *Šaihs*, and relate these to the period and historical development through which the Order passed.

I. Ardabil

A few words on Ardabil the town and on its location will help explain certain special peculiarities which the Order furnished. The geographical position of the small town is of extreme importance for a proper understanding of the activity and later development of the family.

As a matter of fact, the entire "province" of Āgarbaigān began to assume a progressively more important role in the area as a whole following the collapse of Bağdād and Iraq in the middle of the thirteenth century. With its capital city of Tabriz, Āgarbaigān was slowly becoming more and more important as the center of the Muslim world at the time². The Mongols soon left Bağdād and built their new capital at Sultāniyā³. In later Ilhānid times Tabriz became many times the seat of the Sultān and the chief center of the government⁴. During the

¹ In dealing with Šaih Ṣafī ad-Dīn and the Ṣafawid family an attempt will be made here to distinguish between the work and activities of the first members of the family and the later ones; i. e. the first four "Heads of the Order" (Ṣafī ad-Dīn, Ṣadr ad-Dīn, Ḫwāġa 'Alī, and Šaih Ibrāhīm) and the second four "Leaders of the Ṣafawid Movement" (Šaih Ḡunaid, Šaih Haidar, Sultān 'Alī Pādišāh, and Šah Ismā'īl). This major division will be undertaken to emphasize what appears to have been a definite break in the family tradition from being representatives of a Sūfi order to becoming a militant group with a policy of conquest and dominion.

² The contemporary Marco Polo in *The Description of the World*, ed. A. C. MOULÉ and Paul PELLION, v. I (London 1938), p. 104, says: "And the city (Tauris) is set in so good a place that the other merchandise comes there conveniently from Indie . . . and from many other places, and therefore many Latin merchants and especially Genoese come there often to buy of those foreign goods that come there from strange distant lands and to do their business." See also B. SPULER, "La situation de l'Iran à l'époque de Marco Polo", in *Oriente Poliano*, Rome, Istituto Italiano per il Medio ed Estremo Oriente, 1957, pp. 121-132; and Cf. V. MINORSKY, "Ādharbāydjān", in *EI*, new edition, on the importance of Āgarbaigān and Tabriz during the Mongol-Ilhānid period.

The city had become so important for European trade that PROGOLOTTI took pains to list toll stations on the road from Ayās (on the Mediterranean) to Tabriz. See Francesco Balducci PROGOLOTTI, *La Pratica della Mercatura*, ed. Allan EVANS (Cambridge, Mass., 1936), pp. 389-91. For a contemporary description of Tabriz (تبریز) see Ibn Faḍl Allāh al-'Umarī (1301-1349), *Masālik al-abṣār* (recent edition of the sections on China, Central Asia, Irān, and the Golden Horde, by Klaus LECH, *Das Mongolische Weltreich*, Wiesbaden 1968), pp. 87-89 of the Arabic text.

³ Southeast of Tabriz on the way to Qazwin. See above p. 24, n. 1; and 'Umarī/LECH, *Masālik*, p. 86 of the text which reads as follows:

وَاسَّسَ السُّلْطَانِيَّةَ فِي عَرَاقِ الْعِبْرِ، بِنَاهَا السُّلْطَانُ مُحَمَّدُ خَدَابَنْدُهُ أُولَمَاتُورُ بْنُ أَرْغُونَ بْنُ أَبِيَا بْنِ هُرَلَا كُو رَفِعٌ بِنَاهَا وَوَسَعَ فَنَاهَا وَأَقْنَتَ قَسْنَاهَا فِي الْخُلُطِ وَالْأَسْوَاقِ، وَجَلَبَ إِلَيْهَا النَّاسَ مِنْ أَقْطَارِ الْأَرْضِ وَمِنْ أَقْطَارِ مُلْكَتِهِ، وَاسْتَجْلَبَ إِلَيْهَا عَمَّا بَطَ لِسْكَانَاهَا مِنَ الْمَدْلُ وَالْإِحْسَانِ. وَهِيَ الْآنُ حَامِرَةٌ كَانَتْ مَرْتَعَةً لِكُثُرَةِ مِنْ اسْتَوْطَنَاهَا وَتَأْخُلَتْ بِهَا وَأَوْلَادُ مِنَ الْوَلَدِ فِيهَا، وَقَدْ مَنَعَتْ عَلَيْهَا مَدْةً بَلْعَ بَنَوَهَا مَيَالَنَ الرِّجَالِ، وَضَمَّنَ مِنْ جَازَ الْمَرْتَبَةِ الْأَكْتَافَ.

⁴ Marco Polo's contemporary description of the people of the city should not go unnoticed: "For many Christians of every sect may be there (i. e. in Tauris/Tabriz); there are Armenians, Nestorians, and Jacobites, and Georgians, and Persians; and there are also men who worship Mahomet; and these are

post-Mongol Čalāyir period, Tabriz and Bağdād rivaled each other as the two "capitals" of the domains which the Čalāyir *sultāns* could at one time or another bring under their sway. Bağdād, too, suffered during this post-Mongol period many destructions as a result of the city having exchanged hands several times by either Čalāyir or Qara-qoyunlu contenders or claimants or others¹.

It has been pointed out that at the height of Muslim Arab hegemony under the 'Abbāsids, the establishment of the Muslim capital on "Persian" (Sāsānid) soil, i. e. in Bağdād, made the Islamic empire "the heir of the ancient empires of the East"². Moving the capital still further eastwards to Āḍarbaīgān, therefore, made the whole of that empire more Persian.

Ardabil lies many miles due east of Tabriz on the way leading ultimately to the Caspian Sea³. Between them, and rising immediately west of Ardabil itself, is the Kūh-i Sabalān (15,784 ft.), the highest peak along the mountain ranges extending from the Elburz north-westwards to the Caucasus range⁴. The geographical importance of Ardabil, however, lies in the fact that its location, roughly thirty miles from the Caspian Sea, controls completely the narrow coastal plain of the Tāliš-Gilān region, which at certain points in this area is only ten miles wide⁵.

The importance of this location had been recognized during the zenith of Arab power in this area; and the famous Bāb al-Abwāb (Darband) pass lies along this narrow plain⁶.

The celebrated Muslim geographer Yāqūt al-Ḥamawi (d. 627/1229) who visited Ardabil in 617/1220 appears to have made a narrow escape from the town before it was occupied by the Mongols and savagely destroyed because its inhabitants had put up a stubborn resistance⁷.

the common people of the city (footnote 3: *cioè il popolo minuto della terra*) who are called Taurisin, and they have different speech among them."; Marco Polo, *The Description of the World*, p. 104. SCHILTBURGER's narrative for the end of the 14th and the beginning of the 15th century is also curious and in part more puzzling: "The chief city of all the kingdoms of Persia is called the city of Thaures. The king of Persia has a larger revenue from Thaures than has the most powerful king in Christendom, because a great many merchants come to it . . . There is also a city called Rei in a large country where they do not believe in Machmet as do other infidels. They believe in a certain Aly who is a great persecutor of the Christian faith; and those of this doctrine are called Raphak (perhaps *rawāfid/rāfidis*)."
See *The Bondage and Travels of Johann Schiltberger*, (from his capture at the battle of Nicopolis in 1396 to his escape and return to Europe in 1427), transl. by J. B. TELLER (The Hakluyt Society, i. 58, 1878), p. 44.

¹ See 'Azzāwl, *Tārīħ*, II, 110, and III, 85, 158, and *passim*. The poet Salmān Sāwāqī describes the city following a big flood that left it in ruins; 'Azzāwl, *Tārīħ*, II, 82-83.

² D. S. MARGOLIOUTH, *The Place of Persia in the History of Islam*, lecture to the Persian Society, April 29, 1925, published London 1925, (translated into Persian by Rašid Yāsimī as *Maqām-i Irān dar tārīħ-i Islām*, Tehran 1321), p. 18.

³ Yāqūt, *Mu'gām al-buldān* (ed. F. WÜSTENFELD, Göttingen 1866), I, 173: «بینها وین تبریز سپه آیام» - *Ibid.*, II, 197-98.

⁴ Damāwand, northeast of Teheran, is 18,376 ft., and Arārat in Turkey near the Soviet-Armenian border is 16,946 ft. On Ardabil see also Amin Ahmad Rāzī, *Hast iqālīm*, III, 251-52; and on Āḍarbaīgān and Ardabil see Ma'sūd KAIHĀN, *Gugrāfiyā-yi muṣassal-i Irān*, II, 150-78, and *Farhang-i gugrāfiyā-yi Irān*, IV, 11-13.

⁵ Incidentally, Ardabil nowadays is only about 20 miles from the Russian border of Soviet Āḍarbaīgān. We may safely assume that its modern location for traditional tactical purposes is also strategically important.

⁶ See G. LE STRANGE, *The Lands of the Eastern Caliphate* (Cambridge, 1905), 159-160; and V. MINORSKY, *Hudūd al-'ālam*, 142, and map p. 398 for the area just north of Ardabil. During the early 'Abbāsid period Ardabil was the capital of the province of Āḍarbaīgān (Le Strange).

⁷ Yāqūt, *Mu'gām al-buldān*, I, 197-98:

«رمی مدینة كبيرة جداً رأينا سنة ١٢٢٠/٦١٧ . . . ثم نزل علينا النز رايدارم (أي أهل آرديل) بعد انتصاري منها، وجرت بينهم وبين

However, the town must have revived from the Mongol onslaught immediately afterwards, for Yāqūt (who died only nine years after his visit to the town) tells us: "Now the town reverted to its former state and even improved, and it is the land of the Tatars (read Mongols)."¹

This revival may be ascribed either to the activity of the remnants of Ardabil's inhabitants who survived the Mongol massacre, or to the fact that the Mongols themselves must have realized the importance of the town as a gateway to the north country. This latter cause is perhaps the more plausible in view of the continued Mongol invasions to the northwest. The mountain passes and river valleys north of Tabriz and Ardabil lead to Armenian and Georgian territory. The river Araxes (flowing eastwards to the Caspian) and, a little to the north, the river Kura (also flowing in the same direction) harbor deep in their valleys such famous centers as Nahgawān and Tiflis.

Along this frontier stretched one of the most important borders between *Dār al-Islām* and *Dār al-harb*². Late in the fourteenth century, the area north of Ardabil was under the control of the local family of the Širwān-śāhs, some of whose members spread their influence and dominion to such big centers to the south of them as Tabriz itself³. We shall later in this chapter see how the relations between members of the Ṣafawid family and the Širwān-śāhs affected the history of the rise of the Ṣafawids in the late fifteenth century.

Therefore, the rise of a šūfī order along one of the most strategic frontiers of *Dār al-Islām* is not to be dismissed as a common phenomenon. Islam never developed the machinery of spreading the religion in the same way Christian missionaries did in the early Middle Ages⁴, and it was left partly to *Şūfī ḥaibis* and their followers to attempt to convert the conquered people to the "straight path".

Unfortunately, however, it is difficult to find any references in the chronicles to the activities of the Šūfī Order of Ardabil among the "infidel" Georgians and Armenians at the more simple and peaceful level of mere religious conversion⁵. This activity, if it could be at all substantiated, is in itself shrouded in other more violent acts of conversion through conquest or by coercion,

أهلها حروب، ومانعوا من أنفسهم أحسن مائة . . . وشربوا شراباً فاستأثر بهم انصرفا عنها وهي على صورة قبيحة من الحراب والله الأعلم . . .

Yāqūt also mentions that "before Islam Ardabil was the capital of the district".

¹ *Ibid.*, 198. On Ardabil see also R. N. FRYE, "Ardabil" in *EI*, new edition (Frēy's article, however, is rather brief and inadequate), and MIRZĀ BĀLĀ, "Erdebil" in *Islam Ansiklopodisi*, with a long list of sources mainly post-Ṣafawid.

² "The region (Ādarbaigān, Armenia, and Arrān) is the abode of merchants, fighters for the faith (*għażiex*), and strangers coming from all parts." MINORSKY, *Hudūd al-Ālam*, 142. "Tiflis . . . is a frontier post (*jaġr*) against the infidels (*bar rūy-i kāfirān*)."*Ibid.*, 144. Yāqūt, *Muġam al-buldān*, I, 173, says about Ādarbaigān:

. . . وهي بلاد فتحت وحرث ما خلت قط منها، فلذلك أكثرب منها شراب . . .

³ See 'Azzāwī, *Tārīħ*, II, 296, and n. 2, and 300; and III, 32 ff. Ḫaibīl Ibrāhīm aš-Širwānī, "the founder of the Darband or Širwān government", had conquered Tabriz but evacuated it in 809/1406 when the news came that Sultān Aḥmad Ḡalāyir was returning to the city. On the later Širwān-śāhs see V. MINORSKY, *A History of Sharwān and Darband*, Annex I, 129 ff. (after Munaggimbāši's *Čāmi' ad-duwal*).

⁴ It is only today in Africa south of the Sahara that Muslim activities have approached anywhere near the zeal of the missionaries of the Christian world.

⁵ One such story is recorded with understandable zeal by Marco Polo during his stay in Tabriz. The Christians of the city, he says, were asked to move a mountain (with reference to Matthew, 17:20, "If you have faith as a grain of mustard seed, you will say to this mountain, 'Move hence to yonder place', and it will move" – RSV) or else become Muslim or suffer death. Marco Polo, *The Description of the World*, 105–112. Mention is made in Ibn Bazzāz, *Ṣafwat aṣ-ṣaṭa'* of a Georgian village whose inhabitants embraced Islam. See NIKITINE, *Essais*, 389.

inasmuch as Islam considered all the external world (i. e. *Dār al-harb*) as enemy territory whose conquest and annexation into the *Dār al-Islām* was an act of religious duty¹.

In this context, the virtual transformation of the Order at Ardabil from a peaceful and contemplative society to a militant and aggressive body of armed warriors with definite *gāzī* overtones, occurred much later towards the middle of the fifteenth century. This extraordinary change that overtook the Order, long after the Ottoman *gāzīs* had pushed into the Balkans, will be discussed and compared to the successful Ottoman experiment in a later section of this study.

2. *Saih Ṣafī ad-Dīn and the Early Ṣafawids*

However, it is sufficient to point out at present that more is known about the Order of Ardabil and its influence among the Turkmān tribes, who since the Mongol conquest had been roaming in a more or less nomadic fashion throughout the entire area under discussion: Irān, Iraq, and Anatolia. This coincided almost exactly with the life span of the founder *Saih Ṣafī ad-Dīn* himself, who was born in 650/1252 at the height of Mongol-Ilhānid power in the area, and who died in 735/1334, eighty-two years later. A Mongol superintendent of finances of nearby Qazwin, a historian, poet, and geographer of the Ilhānid period, Ḥamd Allāh Mustaufi of Qazwin², has left us one of the earliest, if not the earliest, authoritative references on *Saih Ṣafī ad-Dīn*, written in 731/1330, only four years before *Saih Ṣafī*'s death. In it he tells us that *Saih Ṣafī ad-Dīn* is still alive and is very influential. The Mongol rulers respect him, and he has saved many people from being harmed at their hands³.

In his geographical work, *Nuzhat al-qulūb*, completed in 741/1340, six years after *Saih Ṣafī*'s death, Ḥamd Allāh Mustaufi – in his description of Ardabil of the fourth clime – mentions *Saih Ṣafī ad-Dīn* again, but by using the formula "May God have mercy on him" we know that the old man had died. Ḥamd Allāh adds the very useful information that most of the people of Ardabil are *Ṣafī*'s and are the followers (*murīds*) of *Saih Ṣafī ad-Dīn*⁴.

These two contemporary references to *Saih Ṣafī*, made by someone who, as a government official, a *mustaufī* or tax-collector, is a highly dependable authority, leave us with two significant facts about the Order of Ardabil during the life of its most illustrious founder; namely, one: the high respect which the Order and *Saih Ṣafī* enjoyed under the Mongols, and two: the curious fact that most of the inhabitants of Ardabil were of the *Ṣafī*'i school and were followers of *Saih Ṣafī ad-Dīn*. In the light of these two facts we shall now attempt to recapitulate certain other controversial matters dealing with the great *Saih*. These matters concern the origin of the family, its claims to an 'Alid descent and its alleged early *ṣī'a* leanings, and whether or not *Saih Ṣafī ad-Dīn* himself was a *sayyid* or was referred to as such by his contemporaries.

¹ This is the "lesser *fiḥād*" as opposed to the "greater *fiḥād*" which is the spiritual and moral conquest of the soul, etc. The "lesser *fiḥād*" is a *fard kifāya* or collective obligation. See E. Tyan, "Djihād" in *EI*, new edition.

² Ḥamd Allāh Mustaufi of Qazwin wrote three important works: *Tarīb-i Guzida*, composed in 731/1330; *Zafarndama*, a poem modeled on Firdausi's *Sāhnāma*, completed in 736/1335; and *Nuzhat al-qulūb*, a geographical work finished in 741/1340. On him see Browne, *LHP*, III, 87–100.

³ Ḥamd Allāh Mustaufi, *Tarīb-i Guzida*, ed. 'Abd al-Husain Nawā'i (Tehran, 1336–39/1958–61), 675: "شیخ سفی الدین اردبیل در حیات است، و مردمی صاحب وقت و قبول عظیم دارد، و ببرکت آنکه مذول را با او ارادت نمام است بسیاری از آن قوم را ایدا ببردم رسانیدن باز ندارد، و این کاری عظیم است".

⁴ Ḥamd Allāh Mustaufi, *Nuzhat al-qulūb*, ed. Guy LE STRANGE, GMS, XXIII, 1331/1913, and translated by him, GMS, XXIII-2, 1919. Reference is from the text, 81/transl., 83–84:

"أردبیل از اقليم جهارم است . . . اکثر (مردم) بر مذهب شافعی اند، و مرید شیخ سفی الدین علیه الرحمه اند."

The whole problem has been discussed at length in a series of three articles on the origin of the Ṣafawids by one of the leading Persian scholars of modern times, Aḥmad KASRAWI (Tabrizi)¹. Other well-known authorities and scholars have also dealt with this subject². The problem need not be revived here in great detail; it may be briefly summarized as follows: the allegation of the 'Alid descent of Saīh Ṣafī and his having been himself a *sayyid* were the work of later Ṣafawid historians whose patrons, the Ṣafawid sāhs, in their attempt to consolidate their power in Irān, caused their court historians to make up such claims.

The work where the interpolation was made concerns a "re-editing" of a book written shortly after Saīh Ṣafī's death by Tawakkul ibn al-Bazzāz ca. 751/1350 entitled *Ṣafwat as-ṣafā*. The "editor" of this work, Abū l-Faṭḥ al-Ḥusainī, who belongs to the reign of Shāh Tahmāsb (930-984/1523-1576), states in the first few pages of his recension that "he had received royal command to revise and correct *Ṣafwat as-ṣafā*"³.

The original work is in effect nothing but an account of Saīh Ṣafī ad-Dīn's birth and early life, his miraculous deeds, his sayings and his speeches, his mode of life, his last malady and death. Ibn al-Bazzāz also mentions Saīh Ṣafī's son, Ṣadr ad-Dīn, and refers to his own relation to the Ardabil Order.

Aḥmad KASRAWI who strongly doubted the genealogical descent of Saīh Ṣafī ad-Dīn from the 'Alids ascribed the story to interpolations by Abū l-Faṭḥ al-Ḥusainī, as well as to Iskandar Munšī, author of the famous work on Shāh 'Abbās, the *Tārīḥ-i 'ālam-ārā-yi 'Abbāsī*⁴. Kasrawi points out that in the period between Saīh Ṣafī ad-Dīn and his great descendant in the sixth generation Shāh Ismā'īl, three changes took place in the tradition: one, Saīh Ṣafī ad-Dīn was not a *sayyid* – his descendants claimed this for him and for themselves; two, Saīh Ṣafī was a *Sunnī* of the Ṣafī'i school – his descendants accepted (*padırıftand*) Shī'ism; and three, Saīh Ṣafī knew Persian and Āḍārī the Turkish dialect of Āḍarbaigān – his descendants knew only Turkish. KASRAWI gives instances where he believes the original text of Ibn al-Bazzāz's *Ṣafwat as-ṣafā* was tampered with and proves this on the basis of variant readings in several manuscripts. In one specific case where the indication was to have been to Saīh Ṣafī ad-Dīn's Sunnī-Ṣafī'i-

¹ The articles appeared originally in *Āyanda*, an erstwhile scholarly Persian journal, v. II (1926-28), pp. 357 ff., 389 ff., and 801 ff. Subsequently, the material appeared in book form under the title *Saīh Ṣafī va tabāraš*, to which the present writer has unfortunately had no access. However, there is every reason to believe that the articles in book form contain no additional information. On KASRAWI see above p. 20, n. 4.

² Z. V. TOGAN, V. MINORSKY, Muḥammad Qazwīnī, and others; see below for a description of their views on this matter.

³ RIEU, *Cat. of Pers. MSS.*, I, 345-46. According to RIEU internal evidence shows that the work, *Ṣafwat as-ṣafā*, was contemporary with Saīh Ṣafī ad-Dīn, and that "the additions of the editor appear to be confined to the preface (*muqaddima*) and the conclusion (*ḥālima*)". The preface deals with prophecies on the advent of Saīh Ṣafī, and the *ḥālima* contains an account of his descendants down to Shāh Tahmāsb. (RIEU is here describing the British Museum MS. Add. 11, 743 of *Ṣafwat as-ṣafā*). – For a detailed analysis of the 1329/1911, 358-page edition of *Ṣafwat as-ṣafā* done by Aḥmad ibn Karīm TABRIZI and published in Bombay, see B. NIKITINE, "Essai d'analyse du *Ṣafwat as-ṣafā*", *J.A.*, 245 (1957), 385-94. This lithograph edition of *Ṣafwat* was not available to me. However, I was able to check most of the references given by the late M. NIKITINE against a photocopy of the India Office MS. of *Ṣafwat*, No. 1842. This manuscript is described by ETHÉ, *Cat. of Pers. MSS.*, I, col. 1008. From the colophon, p. 342 b, it appears that this copy is an autograph of Tawakkul ibn Ismā'īl ibn Ḥāggī al-Ardabīll (Ibn-i Bazzāz), dated Sa'bān 759/July-August 1358, i. e. about 23 years after the death of Saīh Ṣafī ad-Dīn. Z. V. TOGAN, in *Mélanges Massignon*, III, 353 ff., is certain that the ETHÉ MS. 1842 is not an autograph, and states that it is the work of a copyist "qui ne serait pas antérieure au 17^e siècle". However, M. TOGAN has not used this MS. in his comparative article mentioned here. For the three MSS. used by him see below, p. 48, note 7.

⁴ On this important chronicle of the period of Shāh 'Abbās completed in 1025/1616, see now DICKSON, *Shāh Tahmāsb and the Uzbeks*, Appendix II, "Sources and Bibliography", lxii.

beliefs, changes had been introduced to make the phrase read: "*Mađhab-o-mašrab-i haqq-i haqiqi-yi Ča'farī . . .*"¹. On the author, KASRAWI concludes that "*Darwiš Tawakkul ibn Ismā'il known as Ibn al-Bazzāz, was from Ardabil, and was a murid of Šaiħ Ṣadr ad-Dīn, son of Šaiħ ad-Dīn. He wrote a book entitled Ṣafwat aš-ṣafā which contains the life, karāmat and maqāmat of Šaiħ Šafi ad-Dīn. This book . . . is the oldest source on Šaiħ Šafi and his ancestors; but unfortunately that book did not come down to us in the form it was written. The copies which we now have had undergone all kinds of manipulations at the hands of the murids of the Ṣafawid family.*"² On the mishandling of the original work KASRAWI goes on to say that "*The murids of that family have changed every statement and story in Ibn al-Bazzāz's book which had indications of the non-sayyid-ship and non-šī'ism of Šaiħ Šafi, or they have removed that altogether. They added stories and statements which agreed with their own inclination and opinion,*"³ and adds that "*(Therefore), every story and statement which has indications of the sayyid-ship of the family is not to be trusted*".⁴

The Persian scholar also draws attention to the fact that Šaiħ Šafi ad-Dīn had only the simple title (*laqab*) of *Šaiħ*, whereas religious figures among his contemporaries or near-contemporaries enjoyed such titles as *sayyid*, *mīr*, or *Šāh*, thus indicating either their 'Alid descent or their holding of temporal power'.⁵

A similar conclusion was arrived at by the great Turkish scholar Zeki Velidi TOGAN working independently many years after KASRAWI⁶. TOGAN again worked with several manuscripts of *Ṣafwat aš-ṣafā*⁷, and gave selections from two of them *in extenso* to show how the original text of Ibn al-Bazzāz had been tampered with⁸. TOGAN concludes that "*Il ne fait aucun doute que les souverains Shāh Ismā'il et Shāh Tahmāsb se sont donné toutes les peines du monde pour effacer de l'histoire leur origine kurde, pour attribuer au kurde Firouz la qualité de descendant du Prophète, et pour faire valoir que le Shaykh Safi était un shaykh turc shī'ite, auteur de poèmes turcs.*"⁹

If Šaiħ Šafi ad-Dīn was neither an 'Alid *sayyid* nor a *šī'i* what then was he? One thing remains quite established: that he was a *Şüfi Šaiħ* having a *ṭarīqa* of his own and through his

¹ KASRAWI, *Āyanda*, II, 362; see also footnote on the same page where KASRAWI mentions the manuscripts he was dealing with.

² *Ibid.*, II, 361.

³ *Ibid.*

⁴ *Ibid.*, II, 362: «هر گونه حکایت و مبارق هم که دلالت بر سیادت آخوندگان داشته باشد محل اطمینان نیست»; Cf. V. MINORSKY in "Tawakkul ibn Bazzāz", *EI*, first edition.

⁵ KASRAWI, *Āyanda*, II, 491. Among the names given are such well-known figures as: سید جمال الدین تبریزی مرشد شیخ زاده گیلان - امیر قاسم یا شاه قاسم انوار تبریزی مرید شیخ صدر الدین - سید محمد مشعشع مؤسس مشعشعیان خوزستان - سید نعمت الله یا شاه نعمت الله (ول) کرمان - سید محمد نور بخش - سید غنیم مرید شاه قاسم انوار and others. Reference will be made to some of these figures and their religious views in a later section below. Cf. a similar view presented by Muhammed QAZWINI in his article "Farmān-i Sultān Ahmad Galāyir", *Yādīgār*, I, No. 4 (Tehran, 1323/1945), p. 29. QAZWINI points out to the form in which Šaiħ Ṣadr ad-Dīn, son and successor of Šafi ad-Dīn, is addressed in the *farmān*, and states that no titles such as *amīr*, *sayyid*, *mūrīd a'lam*, *sultān al-ītra*, or *gālīl al-ašrāf* are used. On the terms *šari夫*, *sayyid*, etc., see RAUPĀTI, *Gōmi' al-Ansāb*, I, Introduction, p. 30 ff.

⁶ Z. V. TOGAN, "Sur l'origine des Safavides", *Mélanges Massignon*, III, (Damascus, 1957) 345-357.

⁷ *Ibid.* Two of the manuscripts date from the pre-Ṣafawid era: Leyden No. 2639 (dated 890/1485), and Ayā Sofia No. 3099 (dated 896/1491), and a third, Ayā Sofia No. 2123 dating from the early years of Shāh Ismā'il, 914/1508. TOGAN compared the two Ayā Sofia MSS., and had K. JAHN compare that with the Leyden MS. for him.

⁸ *Ibid.* for texts compared, pp. 347-51 and 354.

⁹ *Ibid.*, 356. In a P. S. to the article in question, TOGAN acknowledges the similar findings by KASRAWI, and refers to KASRAWI's *Šaiħ Šafi wa-labdras* (Tehran 1323/1944). See above p. 47, note 1.

saintly way of life he had attracted the attention of both the ruling power of the Mongols and the common people, first in his home town and then far and wide among the roaming and restless Turkmān tribes. As Faḍl Allāh ibn Rūzbihān Ḥunḡī (whom we met in the preceding chapter refuting a ſī'i work by Ibn al-Muṭahhar al-Ḥillī)¹ puts it in his *Tārīh-i 'Ālam-ārā-yi Amīnī*: "The first who raised the ensign of excellence in this family was the unique of the world Shaykh Ṣafī al-Dīn Ishqāq . . . (who) finished his days in Ardabil, where he was directing his followers. The amirs of Ṭālīsh turned his residence into their refuge and the great men of Rūm honoured him."²

In several places of *Ṣafwat as-ṣafā*, the *sīra* ("role" – so to speak) of Ṣaiḥ Ṣafī ad-Dīn is described. "In his entire life", we are told, "he followed the *ṣarī'a* to such an extent that, in his words and deeds, not a hair-breadth did he deviate from it".³ In the section describing the granting of succession (*istiḥlāf* and *iğāza*) from Ṣaiḥ Zāhid to Ṣaiḥ Ṣafī ad-Dīn⁴, it is spelled out that the Order shall have nothing to do with the squabbles between the various Muslim sects (*bida'*), and that "in this place (i. e. in Ardabil), except for the *sunna* and *gāmā'a*, there has not been and there is no dispute and diversity of opinion of the schools (*madāhib*) such as the Aš'ariya, Mu'tazila, Qadariya, Mušabbaha, Muğassama, Mu'attala, and others".⁵

Ṣaiḥ Ṣafī was asked once: "What is your *madhab*?" He replied that he believed in the *madhab* of the *imāms* (i. e. the four schools of Abū Hanīfa, Ṣafī'i, Mālik, and Ibn Ḥanbal) whom he loved, and that from among the (four) *madāhib* he chose those *hadīṣ* that had the strongest chain of authority (*asnād*) and are the best (*ağwād*), and applied them. He added that he did not allow for himself or his *murīds* any licence in these matters but rather carried out the details that are expressed in the various *madāhib*.⁶

It appears too that Ṣaiḥ Ṣafī ad-Dīn had left some written material before he died. This, however, has not come down to us in any "collected" form. And while the statements and sayings ascribed to Ṣaiḥ Ṣafī in the innumerable *hikāyāt* of *Ṣafwat as-ṣafā* (as told to Ibn al-Bazzāz upon the authority of Ṣaiḥ Ṣafī's son, Ṣaiḥ Ṣadr ad-Dīn, as well as by many other contemporaries of Ṣaiḥ Ṣafī) can be more or less trusted and accepted, the actual work or works (including poetry) said to have been written by Ṣaiḥ Ṣafī himself await a close and thorough investigation before they can be accepted as authentic writings.⁷ The weight of the

¹ See above, p. 30, n. 8.

² Ḥunḡī/MINORSKY, Persia, 62. Ibn Rūzbihān Ḥunḡī mentions an invitation to Ṣaiḥ Ṣafī ad-Dīn by Sultān Ulġaitū to which Ṣadr ad-Dīn was sent to represent his father.

³ *Ṣafwat as-ṣafā*, p. 250a (Chapter Eight: On the *sīra* of Ṣaiḥ Ṣafī ad-Dīn; Section One: On his following in the footsteps of the Prophet):

"در مجموع عمر چنان قدم بر متابعت شریمت نهاد که ازو سر مولی خلاف شریمت در وجود نیامد نه بقول نه ب فعل."

⁴ Which begins p. 30b, and is entitled:

"در ذکر استخلاف شیخ زاده قدس الله روحه العزیز شیخ صن الدین را قدس الله سره واجازه توبه وتلقین دادن."

⁵ *Ṣafwat as-ṣafā*, p. 35b:

"در اینجا (یعنی در اردبیل) پنیر از سنت و جماعت خلاف و اختلاف مذاهب چون اشعریه و معترله و قدریه و مشبهه و جعشه و سلطنه وغیرها هرگز نبوده و نباشد."

⁶ *Ibid.*, 250b–251a:

"فصل دوم: در مذهب شیخ صن الدین قدس الله سره که شیخ را مذهب چیست؟ فرمود که ما مذهب ائمه داریم و ائمه را دوست داریم و در مذاهب هر چه آئند و اجردی بود آزا اختیار کرد و بدان عمل میکرد. و راه رخصت و سهوالت بر خود و بریدان منته و بسته میگردانید که رخصت میدان نفس را فراخ میکند و بدقایق آقاویل وجود که در مذاهب است کار میکرد."

⁷ The whole question of the writings of Ṣaiḥ Ṣafī ad-Dīn needs to be studied carefully: Fażlī Isfahānī, the author of *Aṣṭal al-awārif* (a Ṣafawid history of Shāh Tahmāsb, written in 1026/1617, on which see now DICKSON, Shāh Tahmāsb and the Uzbeks, Appendix II, "Sources and Bibliography", p. xlvi), mentions a work entitled *Maqāmat wa-maqālāt* ascribed to Ṣaiḥ Ṣafī ad-Dīn. According to MINORSKY (T. M., 113,

evidence here appears to be that this material is of a much later vintage, and that all if not most of it is apocryphal. Much of it seems to have emanated from an original source which may be none other than the *Safwal aṣ-ṣafā* itself.

The claim to *sayyid*-ship relating the Ṣafawid *dūdmān* to Ḥazrat-i 'Ali involves only one section of Saīḥ Ṣafī ad-Dīn's genealogy – that which precedes his ancestor Firuz-ṣāḥ (zarrīn-

n. 6 and "A Mongol Decree . . .", *BSOAS*, 16 (1954), 516, n. 1), the work appears to be "the extraordinary events of the life of (Saīḥ Ṣafī ad-Dīn's) ancestors and his own to the year 735/1334." Saīḥ Ṣafī wrote this collection, which was evidently intended for the guidance of his followers, in Persian and Turkish in a book called *Qard-mağmū'a*, and gave them the title of *Siyar aṣ-ṣūfiya*.

Chardin who traveled in Iran during the late Ṣafawid period states (according to MINORSKY, *T. M.*, 113 – the reference there is to *Voyages de Chevalier Chardin*, ed. LANGLÉS, 10. v. Paris 1811) that before the ṣāḥ went to war auguries were read from the book *Kardğamea* supposed to have been written by Saīḥ Ṣafī. MINORSKY believes that the *Kardğamea* is the same as the *Maqādīl wa-maqādīl* mentioned by the author of *Aṣṭal al-tawārīḥ*. – In the list of Šī'l works, *Kaṣf al-huḡub wal-astār*, by KANTŪRĪ, a short entry (No. 2669) describes a book entitled *Ṣafwal al-anbiyā' fī dihr karāndīl al-aqīdāb*, written by "Saīḥ Ṣafī ad-Dīn Ishaq al-Ardabīlī who died in 735/1334; the book is mentioned by Saīḥ Bahā'ī in his *Taudīh al-maqāṣid* where he says that it is a famous work".

A work on the scholars of Āğarbaigān, the *Dānişmandān-i Āğarbaigān*, compiled by Muhammed 'Alī Tarbiyat (Tehran 1314/1936), refers in the entry on Saīḥ Ṣafī ad-Dīn (p. 234) to the fact that the *Qard-mağmū'a* was not to be found except in the library of the Ṣafawid Sāḥs:

"باقالی وغیریں نیز در تذکرہ پارسی و ترک خودشان شرح حال منفصل از دی (ینی شیخ صنف الدین) نوشته و کتاب بعنوان «قا مجموعه» بحضرت شیخ نسبت داده و گفته اند نسخه آن مجموعه جز در خزانه کتب سلطانی صفویه در جای دیگر موجود نیست. غربی مزبور استطراداً قصتی از محتويات آرا نیز ذکر کرده است".

The above mentioned Baqā'ī "was a well-known qāḍī of Ardabil and wrote poetry in Turkish"; *ibid.*, p. 70. Garbī could not be further identified.

Sams ad-Dīn PARWIZI, a modern writer, in his work *Kitāb Taṣdīkāt al-a'aliyā'* (Tabriz 1332/1373/1953-54), quotes from Ibn al-Bazzāz' *Ṣafwal aṣ-ṣafā*, and refers to it by the title:] مفاتیح الصنا - مفاتیح حضرت شیخ صنف الدین اردبیلی (p. 203). Incidentally, PARWIZI attacks KASRAWI for his anti-ṣūfi views (p. 28-29). The *a'aliyā'* with whom this work deals claim descent from the 8th Imām, 'Alī ar-Ridā.

Z. V. TOGAN in "Londra ve Tahrandaki İslami yazmaların bazılara dair", *İslam Tezikleri Enstitüsü Dergisi*, v. III, pts. 1-2, 1959-60 (İstanbul 1960), lists two manuscripts at the "Kütüphane-i Saltanatı" of Tehran: No. 847, *Tezkire-i Seyh Safi*, and No. 2762, *Maqādīl-i Turki Seyh Safi*. The former, he says, was written by Hāggī Tawakkull (Ibn Bazzāz), translated by Muhammed Širāzī: a mixture of Čagatay and Āğari of the Oğuz Turks; the work goes back to the early Ṣafawids. The latter (see also his article in *Mélanges Massignon*, III, p. 355, where the number of this MS. is given as 2761) originally by Tawakkull, was translated under Sāḥ Tahmāsb in 949/1542 to Čagatay mixed with west Turkish.

Perhaps of another type of material, but also ascribed to Saīḥ Ṣafī ad-Dīn, is the *Manqib* or *Buyūruq*, the text of which is given (pp. 145-191) in a work by Ahmād Hāmid aṣ-ṢARRĀF entitled *aṣ-Ṣabak: min sīraq al-gulāb fī al-'Irāq*, Bagdad 1373/1954. The work is in Ottoman Turkish (?) and is largely a dialogue between Saīḥ Ṣafī ad-Dīn and Saīḥ Ṣadr ad-Dīn. It urges piety, good deeds, faithfulness to the family of the Prophet, etc., and contains prayers, mirror literature, ṣūfi utterances, and the like (*Ibid.*, pp. 3-7, and Arabic translation pp. 192-217). The *Buyūruq* also contains some verse by Hāttā'ī, i. e. Sāḥ Ismā'īl. aṣ-ṢARRĀF is of the opinion (p. 143) that the author "was a contemporary of Saīḥ Ṣadr ad-Dīn, and one of his disciples and murids". TOGAN in the article mentioned above, p. 152, states that the *Buyūruq* is the western Turkish form of Tawakkull's *Ṣafwal aṣ-ṣafā*.

Finally, reference should be made to a short excerpt (pp. 87-92 of the text, 130-131 of the summary translation) from a work called "Taṣkara-yi a'lā" reproduced by W. IVANOW in his *Maqāmā-yi rasd'il wa aṣ-ṣar-i Aḥl-i Haqq*, (English title: *The Truth-worshippers of Kurdistan; Aḥl-i Haqq texts*), Brill, 1953. This excerpt ends with the following curious statement:

"ویهد از رحلت شیخ زاده مجاور گردید. ودو تا پس از شیخ صن بظهور آمد: یک شاه نعمت الله بود ویکی دیگر شاه بود. و شاه نعمت الله عزیز شد و شاه حیدر مجاور شد که شاه اسماعیل از او بوجود آمد".

– which should give one some idea of how the tradition had become, with the passage of time, mutilated beyond recognition.

kulâh). That from Firûz to Şaih Şâfi (through 'Awâd, Muhammâd, Şâlâh, Quṭb ad-Dîn, and Gibrâ'il) appears to be fairly well-established and is generally accepted as authentic. The fourteen generations which relate Firûz-şâh to the Seventh Imâm Mûsâ al-Kâzîm is recognized as spurious and as the work of later Şâfawîd authors¹.

However, in order to appreciate better the growth and development of the Ardabil Order and trace the changes that overtook it during the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries and, at the same time, follow its relations geographically and dynastically throughout the area under consideration (i. e. İrân, Iraq, and Anatolia), it is best to treat it under three broad headings: one, the background period of Şaih Şâfi's ancestors from Firûz-şâh through Şaih Amin ad-Dîn Gibrâ'il; two, the period of the Şüfi order proper from Şaih Şâfi through Şadr ad-Dîn, Hwâga 'Ali, and Şaih Ibrâhim; and three, the period of the later leaders of the "Ardabil movement", i. e. Ǧunaïd, Hâidâr, Sultân 'Ali, and Şâh Ismâ'il. (Between the period of the Ardabil "Order" and that of the Ardabil "movement" two short digressions will be introduced, one dealing with the contemporary question of folk Islam in Anatolia, and the other summing up the story of ı̄ndâ'ašârî Si'ism as it developed during the period of the post-İlhânîd successor dynasties.)

3. From Firûz-şâh through Amin ad-Dîn Gibrâ'il: The Beginnings

No substantive information is to be found in the sources about the ancestors of Şaih Şâfi ad-Dîn before Firûz-şâh other than the doubtful genealogical line that relates Şaih Şâfi to the Sixth Imâm Mûsâ al-Kâzîm.

From Firûz-şâh to Şaih Şâfi the "historical" information is sketchy, but the picture can be fairly reconstructed: It is that of a well-to-do family holding Ardabil and its dependencies as an *iqtâ'* from the central government. Firûz is both wealthy and well-versed in the religious sciences; he chose Gilân as the pasture ground for his large flocks. 'Awâd for some unknown reason chose to spend most of his life in the nearby village of Isfarangân. Muhammâd showed early signs of şüfîsm: he disappeared for a few years and then showed up wearing a head gear and cloak peculiar to Şüfîs. We are told that the people when they saw that were amazed. Şâlâh ad-Dîn Rašîd reverted to agriculture and the ways of *dihqâns* – the traditional occupation

¹ A work which combines the traditional account as well as later Şâfawîd accretions is *Silsilat an-nasab-i Şâfawîya*, composed during the reign of Şâh Sulaimân (1078–1106/1667–94) by Şaih Husain ibn Abdâl Zâhidî, a descendant of Şaih Zâhid of Gilân the *murâsid* of Şaih Şâfi. The *Silsilat* deals more with the religious-şüfî "history" rather than the political-Şî'i aspects of the Şâfawîd family (see BROWNE, "Note . . .", *JRAS* (1921), 396–97 and 416). A long *ħâlimâ* (pp. 74–116) is in fact on the Zâhidî family itself and its relations to the Şâfawîd *dâdâmân* (for a genealogical table of the Zâhidîs see MINORSKY, "A Mongol Decree" 517). The author who seems to be using Ibn al-Bazzâz' *Safwat as-sâfiâ* rather extensively (as well as other sources; cf. the *Silsilat*, pp. 45–50 with the photostatic text in H. HORST, *Timur und Hôga 'Ali*, p. 5b) does not appear to be interested in the Ǧunaïd-Hâidâr movement (to which he devotes only pp. 66–67) but is concerned rather with the earlier Şüfi period of the Order. The genealogical descent of the family according to *Silsilat* (pp. 10–11) is as follows:

شیخ صنف الدین ابو الفتح احمق ابن شیخ امین الدین جبرائیل بن قطب الدین ابن صالح بن محمد الحافظ ابن عوض ابن فیروز شاه زرین
کلاهه ابن محمد ابن شرفشاه ابن محمد ابن حسن ابن سید محمد ابن ابراهیم ابن سید جعفر بن سید محمد ابن سید اسحاق بن سید محمد بن
سید احمد اعرابی بن سید قاسم حزے ابن موسی الكاظم ابن جعفر الصادق ابن محمد الباقر ابن امام زین العابدین ابن
حسین ابن علی ابن ابی طالب علیه السلام.

Cf. Hwândamîr, *Hâbib as-siyâr*, IV, 409–410. There are minor differences between this and the list in *Safwat as-sâfiâ* (p. 8a): all sayyids have been added here, the additional *hunya* "Abu Bakr" is deleted from Quṭb ad-Dîn's name, and so is the *nisba* "al-Kurdî" from that of Firûz-şâh. In the list of children and grand-children of Mûsâ ibn Ğâ'far al-Şâdiq given in Rawzâti, *Ğâmi' al-ansâb*, I, text, p. 2, no ȴamza ibn Mûsâ is mentioned.

of the family. With Qutb ad-Din (Şaih Şafi's grandfather), the first mention is made of an attack by the Georgians who occupy Ardabil and plunder it, killing several thousands of its inhabitants. Qutb ad-Din is pictured as a mighty warrior whose "heroic" deeds are described in some detail. His son Amin ad-Din Ğibrâ'il turns to agriculture and pious worship¹.

Aside from the clash with the Georgians during Qutb ad-Din's time, the "history" of Şaih Şafi's six ancestors does not furnish us with anything outstanding about the family before Şaih Şafi's time. The "war" with the Georgians, however, presaged of things to come, and in it can be seen the beginnings of the *gāzī* activities of the Order. These, however, were not to become full-fledged until the coming of Ǧunaid and Ḥaidar almost two and a half centuries afterwards.

4. From Şaih Şafi ad-Din to Şaih Ibrâhim: The Şüfî Order

The next period, i. e. that of Şaih Şafi ad-Din, his son, his grandson, and his great-grandson, covers the affairs of the Order of Ardabil until the mid-fifteenth century. This is a richly documented period, and one feels that the sources, both hagiographical, biographical and chronicle, treat it with a nostalgia reminiscent of the way Arab and Muslim classical historians treat the era of the Prophet and the first four Caliphs. There is perhaps more similarity in this than strikes the eye at first glance. For this is the period of the establishment of the Order and of its first four heads: pious men of exemplary conduct and character, loved by their followers and respected by the temporal powers in Tabriz or Sultaniya, in Bağdâd or Mâwarâ'annahr, by Mongols, İlhânids, Ğalâyirs, Cübâniyâ, Timûr, and the Timûrids. The later chroniclers from Ḥwândamîr through Ḥasan-i Rümlü, Iskandar Munşî, Zâhidî, and many others, talk briefly but reverently about Şaih Şafi, Şaih Şadr, Ḥwâga 'Ali, and Şaih Ibrâhim. It sounds like the "golden age". Even tempestuous Sunni authors like Faqîl Allâh ibn Rûzbihân Ḥungî have only good words to say about "the unique of the world Şaih Şafi ad-Din Ishâq" and his immediate successors².

Şaih Şafi is pictured in the sources as a man with a message and a driving force. He is at once a holy man and a man who is worldly-wise. Almost every page of the long and ponderous *Şafwat as-ṣafâ* pays tribute to his wisdom, his piety, and his deep knowledge both of the religious and secular sciences³. In short, he is the quintessence and end result of centuries of

¹ On Flîrûz-şâh see *Şafwat*, 8b; *Habib as-siyar*, IV, 410; and *Silsilat*, 11. On 'Awâd see *Şafwat*, 9a (which calls him 'Awwâd); *Habib*, IV, 410–11; and *Silsilat*, 11. On Muhammed (who is further described as al-Ḥâfiẓ, i. e. of the Qur'an) see *Şafwat*, 9a; *Habib*, IV, 411; and *Silsilat*, 11. Şâlih in the *Silsilat* is probably an error; both *Şafwat* and *Habib as-siyar* have Şâlah. On Qutb ad-Din see *Şafwat*, 9a–9b; *Habib*, IV, 411–12; and *Silsilat*, 12 (the *Silsilat* has Abû Bâqî instead of Abû Bakr). And finally on Amin ad-Din Ğibrâ'il see *Habib*, IV, 412–13; and *Silsilat*, 14.

According to NIKITINE (*Essai*, 391) the attack by the Georgians on Ardabil is the only historical event in the *Şafwat*, the rest being Mongolica. The raid, according to MINORSKY, *Studies in Caucasian History*, p. 103 and n. 1, was in revenge of the sack of Ani by the "sultân" of Ardabil. The surrounding area was still in a state of destruction during Şaih Şafi ad-Din; see *Şafwat*, 171a.

² See above, p. 49.

³ *Şafwat as-ṣafâ*, 10b, testifies to Şaih Şafi's well-rounded education:

واز اشعار ونکات ولطایف حظی تمام یافت واز لغات عربی و ترک و پارسی و مغولی حظی را فر یافت.

The *Silsilat* reproduces several couplets by him in dialect (Gîlâklî, according to BROWNE, "Note", 402) which the author explains in "standard" Persian. In one of them (p. 31) "[Hażrat-i 'Ali] murtâza" is mentioned, and in another – this time a Persian *rubâ'i* – the words "mihr-i 'Ali" occur, (p. 35). Șarrâf in *aš-Šabak*, p. 240, quotes another Persian *rubâ'i* ascribed to Şaih Şafi ad-Din:

از من پرسان کلام بسیار ای دل	هر که که رسی بخلوت یار ای دل
زهار ای دل هزار زهار ای دل	و آنکه خبر از خرابی حالم گر

Islamic culture. His *karāmāt* ("miracles" is perhaps not the most felicitous translation) are remembered through many successive generations¹.

In true Şüfi fashion Şaih Şafi ad-Din spent the better part of his life in search for inspiration and guidance, which he finally found in the company of Şaih Zāhid of Gilān whose *fariqa* goes back to 'Ali and Muhammad through a long chain of Şüfi leaders which includes such luminaries as Abū Na'ib Suhrawardi and Hasan al-Baṣrī². He accompanied Şaih Zāhid for twenty-five years, took his daughter to wife, and became head of the Order upon Şaih Zāhid's death³. His followers, according to the exaggerations of the sources, became innumerable⁴.

The Order was highly respected by the civil authorities both during Şaih Şafi's days and those of his three immediate successors. The Mongol Ilhāns and their chief ministers paid homage to Şaih Şafi ad-Din⁵; so did the Čalāyirs to Şaih Sadr ad-Din⁶; and Timūr and his successors to Ḥwāġa 'Alī⁷. This high esteem to the Order and its *Şaihs* in fact continued into the fifteenth century during the later dynasties of the Qara-qoyunlu and Aq-qoyunlu. But at that time, as we shall see, the approach was totally different, for by then the Order had become a power to contend with and a force to seek assistance and support from.

Şaih Şaff is said to have refused an autograph copy of the *Gulistān* presented to him by Sa'dī, saying: «با این دیوان بخدا نمی توان رسید» - See NIKITINE, *Essai*, 389.

¹ *Safwat as-ṣafā* explains the difference between *mu'ğizat* and *karāmat* as follows: *nubuwatal* (prophecy) and *wahy* (revelation) equals *mu'ğizat*; while *wilđyal* (sanctity?) plus *ihđim* (inspiration) equal *karāmat*. See NIKITINE, *Essai*, 388. Cf. Čāmi, *Nafahāt al-uns*, text, p. 21 ff., the section entitled "al-Farq bain al-mu'ğiza wa al-karāma".

² *Safwat*, 35b-36b.

³ And gives in marriage his own daughter (by a previous marriage) to Şaih Zāhid's son, Sams ad-Din. The author of the *Silsilat* is the distant descendant of this match. Cf. *Şafwat*, 17a ff. and 34a. On Şaih Şaff in *Habib as-siyar* see IV, 413-20. The story of Şaih Şaff and Şaih Sadr in *Šūštarī*, *Mağālis*, 264, has nothing new to offer except perhaps the fact that there is no mention in it of the period of Ğunaid and Ḥaidar.

⁴ *Silsilat*, 38:

«مولانا شمس الدین برنیق که از ولایت اردبیل است گفت: از راه مراغه و قبریز شار طالبان و مشتاقان نمودم در سه ماه سیزده هزار طالب به این یک راه بحضور شیخ آمدند و شرف حضور مبارک در یافته و توبه کردند. واز باق اطراف برین قیاس

⁵ Rašīd ad-Dīn Fadl Allāh, *Muhibbatul-i Rašīdi*, letter No. 45 (pp. 265-272) addressed to Şaih Şaff himself; and letter No. 49 (pp. 293-311) addressed to Rašīd ad-Dīn's son, Mīr Aḥmad, governor of Ardabīl. On these letters see also BROWNE, *LHP*, III, 80-87. In his salutations Rašīd ad-Dīn does not use any expressions that might indicate the 'Alid origin of the Ṣafawid family.

⁶ See the *fīrmān* issued by Sultān Aḥmad Čalāyir, addressed to:

«حاکم زنواب و متصرفان و بیتکجیان . . . اردبیل و تراویح و نواحی آن dated 22 Dū l-Qa'da 773/26 May 1372 when Sultān Aḥmad during the reign of his father Sultān Uwais held Ardabīl as a *soyūrgāl* (he became Sultān in 784/1382-83). In it Aḥmad Čalāyir states that:

«این حکم برلیغ نفاذ یافت تا بهمه انواع در ترقی خاطر مبارک او (یعنی شیخ صدر الدین) و مریدان او کوشش و رعایت جانب ایشان من کل الرجوه واجب دانده».

The *fīrmān* was first published by H. MASSÉ, "Ordonnance rendue par le prince Ilkanien Aḥmad Jalair en faveur du Cheikh Sadr-Oddin (1305-1392)", *Journal Asiatique*, 230 (1938), 465-68; and subsequently by Muḥammad Qazwīnī, "Fīrmān-i Sultān Aḥmad Galāyir", *Yādīgār*, I, No. 4 (1944), 25-29. The *fīrmān* refers to Şaih Sadr ad-Dīn as:

«اعظم سلطان الشایخ والحقین قدرة السالکین ناصح الملوك والسلطان مرشد الخلائق اجمعین» i. e., no epithets such as *sayyid* are used to indicate the 'Alid origins of Şaih Sadr or his ancestors. For partial facsimiles of the *fīrmān* see now Ğahāngīr QĀ'IMMAQĀMI, "Fīrmān-i mansūb bi-Sultān Aḥmad Čalāyir", *Barrasīhā-yi Tārihi* III/5 (1347), p. 273-80, and Širīn Bayānī, *Tārihi Al-i Čalāyir*, Tehran 1345, p. 221-27.

⁷ On Ḥwāġa 'Alī and Timūr see below p. 54, note 4.

Şaih Şadr ad-Din's tenure extended from the end of Mongol-Ilhānid power almost to the end of the fourteenth century and the arrival of Timūr on the Iranian scene. This period of the Order is marked by the "conversion" of perhaps its most illustrious member, Sāh Qāsim-i Anwār, and the stepping up of the Order's activity in 'Irāq-i 'Ağam and Ḥurāṣān¹.

The period of Şaih Şadr ad-Din, like the disturbed times in which he lived, was marked by grave hardships to the Order. There were persecutions, and Şaih Şadr even spent some time in prison². But for this same reason the followers of the Order increased and people found refuge in it from the unsettled times.

Gazā activity shows up again and the Georgians, we are told, carried away the door of the mosque of Ardabil. Şaih Şadr and his followers recovered it and brought it back to the city³.

During Ḫwāga 'Ali's period (of roughly a quarter of a century), the affairs of the Order prospered to such a degree that the şüfî Şaih could wield so much weight and influence as to ask the great Timūr to set free certain captives he had brought back with him from Anatolia after his victory over the Ottoman Sulṭān Bāyezid at Ankara in 804/1402. The significant point here, though, is the fact that these captives were followers of the Order, and when set free they were sent back home to Anatolia, with representatives (*būlāfā*) appointed to go with them, and were told, "Let your coming and goings be not infrequent, for the advent of the righteous Duodeciman (*iḥnā'ašārī*) religion is nigh and you must be ready to sacrifice your lives"⁴. Ḫwāga 'Ali himself died in Palestine where he had been making converts in Mamlūk territory⁵.

¹ *Silsilat*, p. 41, and *Habib as-siyar*, the section on Şaih Sadr ad-Din, IV, 420-23. On Qāsim-i Anwār see Sa'Id NAFISI, ed., *Kulliyāt-i Qāsim-i Anwār* (Tehran 1337/1959), where the editor in a 112-page introduction quotes from thirty-three authorities ranging from 'Abd ar-Razzāq Samarcandī through Ġāmī, Daulat-şāh, Ḫwāndamīr, Husain Baiqarā (*Mağdīs al-'usṣāq*), Sām Mirzā (*Taqhīra-yi Sāmī*), Rūmlū, Amīn Ahmād Rāzī (*Haft Iqlīm*), Sūstārī (*Mağdīs*), Iskandar Munīrī, Zāhidi (*Silsilat*) . . . to Rīzā Qulīhān Hidāyat (*Mağma' al-fuṣahā*).

² *Silsilat*, 42-43. This was the period of Malik Ašraf Cūbānī, brother of Şaih Ḥasan-i Küçik (on whom see 'Abbās İQBĀL, *Tārīħ*, 453-54). Ḥāfiẓ-i Abrū/BAYĀNĪ, *Chronique des Rois Mongoles en Iran*, II, 153.

³ *Silsilat*, 43-44.

⁴ Minorsky, T. M., 190 and n. 1 (quoted from "The Anonymous History of Şāh Ismā'īl", Cambridge MS., Add., 200, 10b. The first part of this chronicle was published by Denison Ross in *JRAS*, 1896, pp. 249-340). However, the author of the *Silsilat* does not mention the return of the captives to Anatolia, but says:

"اسیران روم را بدو (یعنی بخواهه عل) بخشد و حضرت شیخ ایشان را آزاد نمود در قرب مزار متبرک گنجه بکول از برای ایشان جای خان
تینین نمود. والمال نسل ایشان در همان مکان توطئن دارند و بصفویان روملو مشهورند".

See *Silsilat*, 48. - On the relation between Timūr and Ḫwāga 'Ali see H. HORST, *Timūr und Ḫwāga 'Ali: Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte Safawiden* (1958). The section on Ḫwāga 'Ali in the *Silsilat* (pp. 45-50) bears great similarity to the text of the *Şukūk*, published in photostat by HORST, which date from 805/1403. These *waqf-nāmas* are referred to by the author of the *Silsilat* (p. 48), and by Iskandar Munīrī in *Tārīħ-i 'Alām-avrā-yi 'Abbāsī*, I, 16. See also HORST, op. cit., 43. - Naṣr Allāh FALSĀFI in *Zandigānī-yi Şāh 'Abbās-i Awwal*, I, 166, n. 2, throws doubt on the story of Timūr and Ḫwāga 'Ali. - E. J. W. GIBB in *A History of Ottoman Poetry*, II, 227-228, n. 4 refers to the freeing of the captives, but wrongly ascribes it to the period of "the Şüfî Sheykh Şadr-ud-Din".

⁵ The story of the death of Ḫwāga 'Ali in Jerusalem is best preserved in Muğīr ad-Din al-'Ulāimī, *al-Uṣūl al-ġalīl bi-tārīħ al-Quds wa al-Hall*, a biographical and historical work completed in 900-901/1494-95. The entry on Ḫwāga 'Ali which occurs in v. II, p. 510 of this work is worth quoting in full:

"الشيخ الصالح العابد علاء الدين أبو الحسن عل بن الشيخ العابد الملك صدر الدين بن الشيخ الصالح صن الدين الارديبل المحمي الزاهد الحجة شيخ الصوفية وابن شيخهم. كان والده من أعيان الصالحين بيده له كرامات ظاهرة وكل ذلك كان ولده الشيخ عل المشار عليه وذكر منه من الكرامات والمناقب ما يطول شرحه. قدم الى دمشق في سنة ثلثين وثمانمائة قاصداً الحج وسمه خلق كثير من أصحابه وأتباعه وجاواره بمكة ثم قدم الى بيت المقدس. ويقال انه شريف علوي توفى بالقدس الشريف في اواخر جمادى الاول منة اثنين وثلاثين وثمانمائة عن نحو سنتين

As to his *sūfi* activities, the sources have preserved to us a *dikr* session during which Ḥwāga 'Ali performed some "miraculous" deeds¹. And in his dealings with the inhabitants of Dizfūl (whom he led back along "the correctly-guided path", *rāh-i hidāyat*)² and with the Yazidis in Syria (whom he had asked Timūr to punish)³, the first signs of inter-sectarian clashes appear, which culminated in the destruction of the independent character of the Muša'šā's early in Sāḥ Ismā'il's reign⁴.

سنة ودفن بباب الرحة بلصق سور المسجد. وكان يوماً مشهور الذفنة وفي أصحابه على قبره قبة كبيرة وهي مشهورة تقصى الزيارة. وهو شيخ الشیخ محمد بن الصانع الشهور علییة الأدبیل الآق ذکر، مع فقهاء الحنفیة.

In the Summer of 1967 I tried to locate the tomb of Ḥwāga 'Ali in Jerusalem near St. Stephen's Gate (Bāb ar-Rahma), but so far without success. 'Ulaimī further has this to say on Ṣaīḥ Muḥammad ibn aṣ-Ṣā'iq, Ḥwāga 'Ali's *ḥalīfa* in Jerusalem (*ibid.*, II, 573):

والشيخ خس الدین محمد بن احمد الشهور باب الصانع الصوفی الحنفی من اهل قلمة الروم. كان من اهل الدين والصلاح وعند فضل وهو خیر متراضع منجع من الناس منزد الشیة عليه أئمۃ الصالیحین. وكان یُعرف علییة الأدبیل نبہ لشیخه الشیخ علی لشیخه الشیخ علی الأدبیل المدفن بباب الرحة. توفی في شهر ستمبر خس وثمانین وثمانمائة ودفن بباب الرحة.

Cf. 'Ulaimī's entry on Ḥwāga 'Ali with that in Saḥāwi, *al-Dau' al-lāmi*, VI, 29, which is much less informative. Perhaps in both cases the source is Ibn Haḡar al-'Asqalāni's *Inbā' al-gumr bi-abnā' al-'umr*, a work being published just now (by Ḥabashī, so far vol. I, Cairo 1969) to which Saḥāwi refers. But 'Ulaimī who was born in Jerusalem and was *qādī* there in 891/1486 appears to be talking from first-hand knowledge. (On him see *GAL*, II, 53–54 and Suppl. II, 41–42).

For a translation (incomplete) of 'Ulaimī's *al-Uns al-ġallī*, see Henry SAUVAIRE, *Histoire de Jérusalem et d'Hébron . . .* (Paris 1876). The section on Ḥwāga 'Ali is not in the parts translated.

The story in BROWNE, *LHP*, IV, 45–46, n. 3, and the references in it to BABINGER and to BROWNE's informant the Rev. Canon J. E. HANAUER, etc. can now be clarified in the light of the above. So too can the mutilated reference to 'Ulaymī in Sūṭarī, *Iḥqāq al-haqqa*, II, 342, n. 1.

Ḩwāndamīr, *Ḩabib as-siyar*, IV, 423–24, does not report the death of Ḥwāga 'Ali in Jerusalem. In fact, ḥwāndamīr is completely uninformed on Ḥwāga 'Ali and his role. Iskandar Mūnī, however, reports it in *Tārīh-i 'Alām-ārū-yi 'Abbāsī*, I, 16, and so does Zāhidī in *Silsilat*, p. 45, where he states:

ومنف شریف ش در قدس خلیل است ودر آنجا مید عل صیر مشهور است.

¹ *Silsilat*, 48 and n. 6. The text appears to be slightly corrupt. However, see HORST Timūr und Ḥoḡd 'Ali, p. 5b of the photostatic text, where the missing word *dūst* is supplied. The author of the *Silsilat*, or more correctly his authority, claims that after Timūr saw this performance, "سرید و معتقد شد".

² *Silsilat*, 46.

³ *Ibid.*, 47. On the Yazidis see 'Abbās AL-'Azzāwī, *Tārīh al-Yazīdiya* (Bagdād 1353/1935), who refers (p. 194) to the appearance of "gūlūl Sūfī doctrines" among the Yazidis at some stage in their development, and argues against views submitted by Th. Menzel in "Yazīdī", *EJ*, first edition.

⁴ W. HINZ accepts the "Sūfī" role of Ḥwāga 'Ali; see his *Irans Aufstieg*, 23. MINORSKY believes that "the fact that the claim to an 'Alid descent on the part of Shaykh Ṣaff was registered already in the Ṣafwat aṣ-ṣaṣṭī is suggestive in itself"; see his review of HINZ's *Irans Aufstieg*, in *BSOAS*, IX (1937–39), 239–43. (But see KASRAWI's and TOGAN's views on the Ṣafwat earlier in this chapter, p. 47 ff.). BROWNE in *Note*, 407, n. 1, feels that the "conversion" of the inhabitants of Dizfūl "is perhaps the earliest sign of strong and decided Shi'a propagandism on the part of the Safawis." See also H. ROEMER's views on Ḥwāga 'Ali in "Die Safawiden", *Saculum*, IV (1953), pp. 28–29. The *Silsilat* has a fairly large collection of *fasālīs* (p. 50–62) written by Ḥwāga 'Ali. Some are *qī'as* or *rubā'īs*. The *tahallus* used is "'Ali", but that is only Ḥwāga 'Ali's name. The author of the *Silsilat* states (p. 50) that:

و دیوان اشعار او . . . در میان طالبان مشهور و معروفت.

The following *rubā'ī* is an example:

نالان وطنان تا که ک آید بیرون.

از چشم پشم من روان شد جیعون

which may be translated as follows:

My love of you has cast me into a Tigris of blood.
The Oxus flows with the tears of my eyes.

مشق تو مرنا نکت در دجله خون

بیچاره دلم نشت در خانه خاک

My poor heart lies in the house of dust;
It moans and throbs till someone helps it out.

During the period of Şaih İbrâhim (which covered the second quarter of the fifteenth century) nothing of any great significance happened, and the activity of the Ardabil Order appears to have hit its lowest point. This corresponded to the era of Şâh Rûh of the Timûrids in the East and of the early Qara-qoyunlus in Äðarbaigân and Iraq – both centralizing and expansionist. The lull during Şaih İbrâhim's time preceded the tempest which began with Günaid¹.

To sum up: we have seen that under the first four leaders of the Ardabil Order (i. e. Şaih Şâfi, Şaih Sadr, Hwâga 'Ali, and Şaih İbrâhim) all indications are that the Order was an important center for the spread and dissemination of Sufi doctrines in Äðarbaigân, eastward into the Timûrid domains, and westward into Anatolia. No palpable signs of Si'ism at the high level of the *iñnâ'ašâris* or the folk level of the *gûlât* are perceptible during this period of the Order's life. And as MINORSKY puts it: "The lords of Ardabil are highly respected *shaykhs* leading a contemplative life, spending their time in prayers and fasting, and credited with supernatural powers."²

The political disorders and confusion which followed the death of the last effective İlhanid Sultan Abû Sa'id appear to have been fertile ground for the spread of the Order. This confusion is best described by the contemporary Ibn Faðl Allâh al-'Umari (d. 749/1349) in his *Masâlik al-abṣâr* where he talks of utter darkness, disunity, and corruption; of claimants to the throne supported by factions here and there. The picture is that of total disruption and complete disorder³.

It seemed natural that during this unsettled period Sufi orders should flourish more than ever before. For in addition to giving the common man some kind of peace of mind at the level of popular folk-Islam, these centers of Sufi shaikhî often were a haven for persons running away from the tyrannical clasp of secular despots. One such case is recorded in the *Muğmal* of Faşîhi of Hwâfî, and another by Ibn Haldûn in his *Târih*⁴. And these need not be the only instances.

¹ *Silsilat*, 65–66. Zâhidî has here a fairly detailed list of Şaih İbrâhim's children and grand-children. A son, Abû Sa'id, was *hikâbdâr* (librarian) of the Order, which may have included propaganda and public relations activity; and a grand-daughter, not named, who became *faqîrbâstî* (BROWNE in "Note", p. 410–11, has *fâqîra-bâstî*), perhaps head of the female members of the Order.

Iskandar Munîî in *Târih-i 'âlam-Ärd-yi 'Abbâsi*, I, 17, talks of Şaih İbrâhim's generosity and the wealth of his kitchen. MINORSKY refers to the possibility that Şaih İbrâhim accompanied Çahân-şâh in a *gazâ* against Georgia. See his "Thomas of Metzop" and the Timûrid-Turkmân Wars" in Professor Muhammad Shafî' Presentation Volume (Lahore, 1955), p. 169.

Abdulbaki GÖLPINARLI in *Yunus Emre: Hayatı* (Istanbul 1936), pp. 137–39, quotes a line of poetry in which the words "Şâh Efendi" and "Şeyh-i Şâh" occur, but dismisses the possibility they may refer to Şaih İbrâhim.

² MINORSKY, T. M., 189.

³ As quoted in Qalqašandî, *Şubb al-a'sâ*, vol. IV, 420–21:

"قال (المرى) في ممالك الأ بصار بعد ذكر أبي سعيد: هم بهذه في دهاء مظلمة وعياء مقتنة لا يفني ليلها آل صباح ولا فرقهم إلى اجتياح ولا فادم إلى صلاح. في كل ناحية هاتف يدعى باسمه وخائف أحد جانبي آل قسمه"

For the original text of this extract (with minor variants) see now 'Umari/LECH, p. 114 of the text. A similar view is given in his (al-'Umari's) *al-Ta'rif bi-al-muṣṭalaḥ as-ṣârif* (Cairo, 1312/1894) p. 43. And cf. Abû al-Fidâ/Ibn al-Wardî, *Kitâb al-muhtaṣâr*, IV, 144:

"ثم دخلت ستة وأربعين وسبعينة والستار مختلفون مقلدون من حين مات القان أبو سعيد وببلاد الشرق والشجر في غلاء وذهب وجور بسبب الخلف من حين وفاته إلى هذه السنة".

(From the year 732, when Abû al-Fidâ died, till the end of the chronicle in the year 749, the work was continued by Ibn al-Wardî, on whom see 'Azzâwi, *al-Ta'rif*, 188–89).

⁴ Faşîhi, *Muğmal*, I, 182: events under the year 810/1407 (or p. 191 where the same story is repeated under the events for the year 811/1408 – perhaps a printing error).

⁵ Ibn Haldûn, *Târih*, V, 553. The lonely mention of Şaih Sadr ad-Dîn of Ardabil here is unfortunately followed by a lacuna in the printed text (Bâlâq 1284/1867).

The sanctity of Ardabil and its environs made it almost a place of pilgrimage. Many Timūrid princes, on expeditions in the West to quell certain rebellious vassals, would pass through Ardabil and pay their respects to the chief of the Order residing there. One such visit is recorded by 'Abd al-Razzāq Samarqandi in his *Maf'a' as-sa'dain* under the year 823/1420¹.

The growing number and importance of Sufi orders during the troubled days of the post-Mongol period in Iran is coupled with activity of a similar nature – perhaps in this case limited to the larger centers of population – carried on by groups of *fityān* or *iḥwān* who set a high standard of conduct and behavior made necessary by the weakening central powers².

A very good description of this situation has been made by the late Persian scholar 'Abbās Iqbāl who in his *Tārīh-i mufaṣṣal* tells us of the increased number of Sufis in Ādarbaigān, Gilān and Māzandarān at the end of Sultān Abū Sa'id's reign. He also speaks of the *ahl-i futuwwat* and the *ahl-i iḥwāwāt*, and adds that in all cases 'Ali ibn Abi Ṭālib was considered the *fatā* and *maulā* of every group of Sufis or *abīs*³.

Of special importance and significance in the latter part of Iqbāl's statement are the references he makes to the special position Hazrat-i 'Ali had in the general picture. This need not give the impression of organized belief in *Sī'ism*, or the *imāmate*, or the Twelve Imāms. For at the popular level of folk Islam such highly controversial questions never really came up, or in fact never could have been understood in their basic religio-theological connotations. 'Ali and the family of the Prophet were honored because of the traditional mystery that had revolved around them since the early days of Islam. In them were all the qualities, real or woven into the tradition by later generations, which a Muslim hoped to possess in a golden age that was nostalgically gone.

A conclusion, more or less similar to that of 'Abbās Iqbāl's, was reached by M. F. KÖPRÜLÜ in his work *Türk edebiyatında ilk mutasavvıflar*, where the great Turkish scholar discusses religious movements in Anatolia during the 7th–10th/13th–15th centuries. KÖPRÜLÜ says (in the words of his translator L. BOUVAT): "Du septième siècle de l'Hégire à la fin du dixième, les mouvements religieux les plus variés se produisent en Asie Mineure. Des ordres religieux: ceux des Babais, des Abdals, des Bektachis, des Houroufis, des Kalenders; des Kizil-Bach, des Haidaris. Le Soufisme est en faveur, mais l'hétérodoxie recrute facilement des adeptes: des faux prophètes font leur apparition, et leurs succès montrent qu'ils trouvent un terrain favorable. Répandu dans toute l'Asie, le mysticisme gagne l'Europe, et s'étend jusqu'aux limites de la Bosnie. L'histoire ottomane alors est une période de guerres et d'atrocités, mais en même

¹ Samarqandi, *Maf'a' as-Sa'dain*, II, pt. 1, pp. 407–8. The visit was made by the Timūrid prince Mīrzā Ibrāhīm Sultān when Ḥwāgā 'Alī was head of the order at Ardabil.

² In his review article of the 1329/1911 Bombay edition of *Şafwat as-safa*, B. NIKITINE counted seventeen "akhs" in the entourage of Śāih Ṣāfi ad-Dīn, one of them had a professional name: Aḥlī Sultān Sāh Haddād. See NIKITINE, "Essai", 393, and n. 14, and cf. in one case *Şafwat*, 331b.

³ 'Abbās Iqbāl, *Tārīh*, 466. Iqbāl's statement is comprehensive and deserves to be quoted in full:
در اواخر دولت سلطان ابو سعید بهادرخان در آذربایجان و گیلان و مازندران عرقاً و متصوفه و دراویش رو بازدید گذاشتند بطوری که هر ناحیه‌ای مرادی گرد خود جماعتی مرید داشت. و چون سلطان ابو سعید اساساً خالف آزاد رساندن بین طایفه بود کسی نیز متعرض ایشان نمیشد. و بهینه‌ی هلت روز بروز عدد مرده شیوخ رو بازدید می‌گذاشت. قسمت عده‌این مریدان در جزء سلسله اهل فتوت یا اهل اخوت داخل بودند و فتحیان و اخوان جماعتی از عوام متصوفه بودند که سعی داشتند اصول عالیه عرفان و تصوف را در میان عame نیز جاری ساخته با تصفیه اخلاق و استحکام میان صفا و وداد بین خود از آن بهره بر دارند. و این جماعت که از مهد خلافت الناصر لدین الله بملت گرویدن او باین طایفه در جمیع مالک اسلامی تشکیلات وزوایا و خانقاها و مهمانخانه‌ها داشتند متفرق بودند. و حضرت امیر المؤمنین عل بن ابی طالب را مطلقاً قی وصول و حسای جمیعت خود میسردند. و از تعصّب مذهبی و آزاد یکدیگر و قتل و غارت و دزدی نیز احتراز داشتند. بلکه مثل فرسان جاھلیت هر برشواهیهای قرون وسطی در اروپا محل ییک سلسله اخلاق مردانه بودند.

temps une période de fermentation religieuse où, à côté de la force brutale, la force morale joue un rôle qui n'est pas négligeable."¹

However, in order to place this statement by KÖPRÜLÜ in its proper context, a few words are needed to describe the religious picture in Anatolia and follow briefly its development during the contemporary period of the Süfi Order at Ardabil.

5. Folk-Islam in Anatolia

The growth and development of folk-Islam in Anatolia during the period which corresponds to the rise and consolidation of the Süfi Order at Ardabil under Saîh Şâfi ad-Din and his immediate successors (i. e. till the mid-fifteenth century) appear to have followed a somewhat different path which, however, had more or less the same result.

The picture is far from clear. There is no definite pattern which can be compared to the success of the experiment which was going on in Ädärbaigân, and which was attracting followers from far and wide – most of all from among the Turkish tribes of Anatolia itself. In fact, the religious situation in Anatolia during this period is utterly confused, and any attempt to find an organized pattern for it will be to give a wrong impression of the religious events themselves.

The explanation for this confused state is difficult to find. Perhaps it can all be blamed on the political situation at the time – which itself was quite disorderly. There was no real central authority in the whole of Anatolia at this time: the last years of the Rûm Selçûq state with its capital city of Qonya were marked by a weakening of whatever central power there was, the complete disintegration of the system, and the rise of numerous petty states (*beyliks*) across the length and breadth of the peninsula. This was followed by a semblance of Mongol control from the seat of the Mongol governor at Siwâs established early in the fourteenth century. However, Anatolia was far away from the center of Mongol authority in Ädärbaigân, and no effective control was exercised. Soon the rising star of the house of Osmân was bringing the neighboring Anatolian *beyliks* into the fold of what appeared to be a new empire; but no sooner was this more or less achieved than a mighty conqueror, Timûr, put an end to it at Ankara in 804/1402. And the painful experiment had to be done all over again after this temporary shake². Further, the role which the Mamlûk sultâns of Egypt played in Anatolia throughout this entire period – a role which at best can be described as divisive – added considerably to the confusion that prevailed. This role never really came to an end until Sultân Selîm conquered Syria and Egypt early in the sixteenth century.

It appears that such a confused political state of affairs was reflected in a similarly confused state of religious growth and development.

¹ M. F. KÖPRÜLÜ, *Türk edebiyatında ilk mutasavvıflar*, İstanbul, 1918. A detailed summary translation, used here, appeared in *Revue du Monde Musulman*, XLIII (1921), pp. 236–282, done by L. BOUVAT, entitled "Les premiers mystiques dans la littérature turque". Of special importance are the tables at the end of the article showing Süfi affiliations, as well as the comprehensive bibliography on this subject, pp. 269–282. (For more information on KÖPRÜLÜ's work, i. e. reviews, translations, and summaries, see Şerif Hulusi SAYMAN, *O. Professor Dr. Fuad Köprülü'nün yazarları için bir Bibliografya*, 1913–1934, İstanbul 1935, p. 5.

Cf. views on this subject by V. MINORSKY in "Bâli-Efendi", 438: "In the eighth/fourteenth century dervishism and Shi'ite influences were widely spread among the Anatolian Turkomans. Characteristic are the great revolts in western Anatolia which broke out in the beginning of the fifteenth century"; and H. J. KISSLING, "The Social and Educational Role of the Dervish Orders in the Ottoman Empire" in *Studies in Islamic Cultural History*, The American Anthropological Association, vol. 56, no. 2, Memoir No. 76 (April 1954), p. 24.

² On this period in Turkish history see the two well-known monographs by M. F. KÖPRÜLÜ, *Les origines de l'Empire Ottomane* (Paris 1935), and P. WITTEK, *The Rise of the Ottoman Empire* (London 1938).

In Irân, on the other hand, at least in Ädarbaigân and along the Bagdâd-Tabriz axis, a tradition of centralized authority continued to exist throughout the Mongol conquest, the Mongol Ilhânid period, and the post-Mongol Çubânid, Galâyîr, Qara-qoyunlu, and Aq-qoyunlu system (with perhaps a short break during the Timûr cataclysm of roughly a quarter of a century from 1381-1405). This relatively stable tradition, which in a way is itself a continuation of the pre-Mongol 'Abbâsid rule in this general area, lent itself to the peaceful growth and development of such a Şüfi order as that founded in Ardabil. This is not to say that order and stability were everywhere supreme.

More important than the political unrest, and no doubt contributing to it in large measure, is the fact that Anatolia from the Selgûq through the Mongol periods, and perhaps even afterwards, was the recipient of large groups of Turco-Mongolian tribes who were pushed westwards in the face of the conquerors from the east¹. These groups, nomadic and disorganized, had no underlying unified structure. Many were attracted further westward and became the *gâzis* of the growing state of Osmân. Others settled wherever they could in the valleys of the Anatolian plateau. It was among these unruly groups that folk Islamic ideas flourished, as opposed to the more sedate religious practices in the urban centers of Anatolia.

But neither the political unrest nor the tribal and nomadic structure of a large section of society is sufficient to explain the confusion at the religious level which obtained in Anatolia during the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. The original question will have to remain unanswered and will have to await a more thorough investigation of the entire religious picture at the time.

The most convenient point of departure for such an examination is the period of Maulâna Galâl ad-Din Rûmi (born at Balh in 604/1207, and died at Qonya in 672/1273), who was a near contemporary of some of the leading religious figures which were dealt with in an earlier chapter of this work, namely Tûsi and Ibn al-Muṭahhar, Ibn Taimiya and Baidâwi². In fact, Rûmi's *Maṭnawi*, one of the best compendiums of Muslim Şüfi thought, should perhaps best be placed within the general context of Islam during the post-Caliphate period; and indeed, the picture of "high Islam" as drawn in an earlier section of this work remains incomplete unless Rûmi and his work and times are brought in to show another aspect of that picture. For Rûmi's *sufism*, as well as – despite the name, – his Mevlevi şüfi order are in essence another manifestation of high Islam, this time not in the traditional centers of Bagdâd, Damascus, and Tabriz, but in their equivalent, the great Rûm Selgûq capital at Qonya. The appeal here again is not so much to the common man but rather to the more cultured and sophisticated inhabitants of the Anatolian cities.

It is difficult to place Rûmi in the religious context of Islam in Anatolia: he is recognized as an orthodox *Sunnî*, and it is hard to find in his work material which may implicate him with any specific *Şî'i* groups³. It is believed, however, that his mysterious relations with that enigmatic character, Sams-i Tabrizi, may point to certain involvements with suspicious *Şî'i* elements rampant at the time.

¹ No figures are available unless a general statement such as the following (by Z. V. TOGAN, "Rise of the Turkish Empire" in *Background of the Middle East*, ed. E. JACKH, 1952, pp. 112-3) can be trusted: "During the era of the Il-Khâns (1256-1336) . . . more than two million Eastern Turks and a number of Mongols came in the wake of Hulagu . . ." On the movement of population (both Turkish and Mongol) as a result of the Mongol invasions, see KÖPRÜLÜ, "Influence du Chamanisme Turc-Mongol . . .", pp. 13-14, n. 24, and the authorities quoted therein. BABINGER talks of "a large body of people (10,000-12,000)" led by Sarî Saltuk into Dobrudja, the move being "perhaps connected with the advance of Hulagu." See his article "Şarî Saltuk Dede" in *EI*, first edition.

² See above, p. 23 ff.

³ The following from *Kulliyâ-i Sams-i Tabrizi* (edited by Badî' al-Zamân FURÛZÂNPAR and 'Ali DAŞT).

Rümi appears to have fallen under the spell of Šams for some time, and is said to have received esoteric teaching by him. Described as a "weird figure, wrapped in coarse black felt, who flits across the stage for a moment and disappears tragically enough"¹. Šams-i Tabrizi is said to have been the son of Čalāl ad-Dīn "Nau-Musalmān", the Ismā'ili grand master of Alāmūt (607–617/1210–1220)². According to R. A. NICHOLSON, the "tremendous spiritual enthusiasm (of Šams-i Tabrizi), based on the conviction that he was a chosen organ and mouthpiece of the Deity, cast a spell over all who entered the enchanted circle of his power."³ The intimacy between Rümi and Šams-i Tabrizi ended abruptly in 644/1246, when Šams was killed in a riot at Qonya⁴.

The exact relation between the *şūfiyyat* of Rümi and the Ismā'ili *da'wa* originating at Alāmūt cannot be resolved here. The late professor E. G. BROWNE, in a letter to E. Denison Ross says that "The question of Şūfism and Ismā'ili doctrine is interesting, and there is a curious connection through Šams-i Tabrizi"; but he hastens to add that "it must be borne in mind that ostensibly all the great Şūfi poets of the older time, like 'Attār and Jalāl al-Dīn, are Sunnis"⁵.

Aside from Rümi, and more in the context of folk Islam in Anatolia, were such well-known figures as Bābā Ishāq, Sari Saltuq and Baraq Bābā, Yunus Emre and Hāggī Bektaş, Hāggī Bayram Wali, Qādi Badr ad-Dīn of Samāwnā, and Āq Šams ad-Dīn, who represented a tradition that can be traced in one way or another to the Central Asian Ḥwāġa Ahmad Yasawī (d. 562/1166–67). This tradition, which can be followed from the thirteenth through the fifteenth centuries, led to such religious and social convulsions as those of the Bābā'i revolt around the mid-thirteenth century and Qādi Badr ad-Dīn's movement at the end of the fourteenth and the beginning of the fifteenth century. It is a tradition at the grass roots which was the expression of discontent and restlessness among the rural masses against the Sunni aristocracy of the Rūm Selḡūq state and later against the Ottoman ruling and religious institutions, and which may be said to have found its culmination in the Ṣī'i revolt and terrible massacres during the early years of Sulṭān Selim.

Tehran, 1336/1958), vol. I, pp. 373–74, *gazal* No. 882, shows excessive *şūfi* views of Hazrat-i 'Ali:

تا نقش زمین بود وزمان بود عل بود	تا صورت و پیوند جهان بود عل بود
از روی یقین بر همه موجود عل بود . . .	چنانکه نظر کردم و دیدم بحقیقت
تا هست عل باشد ونا بود عل بود	این کفر نباشد من کفر نه اینست
شم الحق تبرز که بنمود عل بود.	سر در جهان جله زینهان وزیدا

¹ R. A. NICHOLSON, *Selected Odes from the Divan-i Shams-i Tabriz*, Introduction, p. xviii.

² Čalāl ad-Dīn "Nau Musalmān" had renounced his Ismā'ili views, declared for Orthodoxy, and paid allegiance to the 'Abbāsid caliph an-Nāṣir. See BROWNE, *LHP*, II, 457–458, and cf. the Introduction to *Kulliyāt-i Šams-i Tabrizi*, 41 ff.

³ NICHOLSON, *op. cit.*, Introduction, p. xx. Ibn Battūṭa refers to Šams as "a man selling sweetmeats" who came into Rümi's college and attracted his attention. Rümi followed him and came back "after many years, but he had become demented and would speak only in Persian rhymed couplets which no one could understand . . . the *Mathnawī*". See Ibn Battūṭa, *Rihla*, 294/GIBB's transl., II, 430–31. On Rümi see also H. RITTER, "Djalāl al-Dīn Rümi", in *EI*, new edition, and the section on Rümi's thought by A. BAUSANI in the same article.

⁴ But KÖPRÜLÜ asks, "Mais Chems-e Tabrizi a-t-il réellement existé?" See KÖPRÜLÜ/BOUVAT, *Türk edebiyatında ilk mutasavvıflar*, p. 256.

⁵ Letter dated 27 September 1891; excerpts in E. Denison Ross' autobiography *Both Ends of the Candle*, London 1943, p. 60. Ḥwānsārī, the author of *Raudat al-ğannāt*, in his biography of Rümi (p. 707 ff.) states: "وقد أطرا في مدحه صاحب مجالس المؤمنين (أي القاضي نور الله شوشترى) وجعله من خلص الشيعة وأيد ذلك بكلمة من أولاد جلال الدين الداعي للدولة الملوية الاسماعيلية".

A few lines later, Ḥwānsārī blasts the Ismā'ili's!

The story of the first mystics in Turkish literature has been told by M. F. KÖPRÜLÜ in a long monograph referred to above (p. 57) which appeared back in 1918. The learned Turkish scholar traces the relations between Ahmed Yasawi and his Anatolian successor Yünus Emre early in the fourteenth century. According to KÖPRÜLÜ, Ahmed Yasawi steered a clear course away from religious controversies¹, but his disciples in Anatolia favored *bāfi* doctrines².

At about this time (ca. 638/1240) the Bābā'i revolt of Bābā Rasūl-Allāh Ishāq among the Turkish elements in Anatolia, with extreme forms of *Šī'ism*, occurred and was directed against the Sunni aristocracy of the Rūm Selḡūq state in the Taurus region and Amasyā, and was suppressed with the assistance of Frankish mercenaries³. This movement, oddly enough, was actively opposed by the aristocratic followers of Ḡalāl ad-Dīn Rūmī and his Mevlevi dervishes⁴. "La revolte des Babais", concludes KÖPRÜLÜ, "était d'autant plus grave, qu'elle se proposait, non seulement la conquête du pouvoir, mais encore la substitution, aux croyances reçues, d'une religion nouvelle."⁵

KÖPRÜLÜ further refutes the tradition that Hāggī Bektaş was a disciple of Yünus Emre⁶. Emre's master was a mystic of the Bābā'is, and the Bektaşis recognized him as one of their spiritual leaders during the ninth/fifteenth century. Emre was above all a moralist poet who respected the *Sāri'a* and the *Sunna*⁷ as seen in his *gazals* and religious poems (the *ilâhi* hymns)⁸. His possible collusion with the Ḥurūfis is dismissed by KÖPRÜLÜ⁹.

¹ KÖPRÜLÜ/BOUVAT, *op. cit.*, 250. See also F. İZ, "Ahmed Yasawi", *EI*, new edition. On *Šī'i* activity in Central Asia see E. BLOCHET, "La conquête des états nestoriens de l'Asie Centrale par les Schiites: les influences Chrétiennes et Bouddhiques dans le dogme Islamique", Paris, 1926, (Extrait de la *Revue de l'Orient Christian*, 3e série, t. XXV, Nos. 1 et 2, 1925-1926, pp. 3-131), pp. 13-14, 16-19, and 43-44.

² KÖPRÜLÜ/BOUVAT, *op. cit.*, 254. Cf. the following statement in *Kitâb an-naqq* (composed ca. 560/1164) by 'Abd al-Ġalî ibn 'Abî al-Fadl al-Qazwînî ar-Râzî, pp. 53-54:

هچ سرای نیست از رکان که در او ده پازده رافقی نیستند و در دیراپام دیران ایشانند.

This statement is contemporary with the death of Ḫwāġa Ahmed Yasawi. At the level of Sufism, the following supporting statement by H. A. R. GIBB in a recent article is worth quoting: "Their (Sūfis') success among the Turks was particularly important since, when the Turks began their immigrations into western Asia and Anatolia in the eleventh century and founded the Turkish states and dynasties, it was to the *Šāfi'i* *shaihhs* rather than the Orthodox 'Ulama' that they looked as their religious teachers and guides. Turkish popular Islam was thus from the first intimately associated with the *Sūfis* and their organizations", see his "The Heritage of Islam in the Modern World II", in *International Journal of Middle East Studies*, Vol. I, No. 3 (July 1970), 224-5.

³ KÖPRÜLÜ/BOUVAT, *op. cit.*, 254-55; and C. L. CAHEN, "Bābā'i", *EI*, new edition.

⁴ Cf. CAHEN, "Bābā'i", *EI*, new edition, who adds that Bābā Ishāq had "allied himself to the extremist forms of Shī'iism which were prevalent in Irano-Turkish popular circles." J. R. WALSH says the Mevlevi order in the 14th and 15th centuries enjoyed the protection of the authorities, "and was used by them to combat the anarchical tendencies of the rural orders, the Bektaşis, the Bābā'is and the Alevis". See his article "Yünus Emre: a 14th century Turkish hymnodist", in *Numen*, VII (1960), 177. V. A. GORDLEVSKY in his *The Empire of the Saljuqs of Asia Minor* gives a modern Russian interpretation. In the words of his reviewer he says that "intending social reforms the revolt (of Bābā Ishāq) took the form of a struggle of the oppressed peasant classes against the feudal groups." See the review article of GORDLEVSKY's work by I. M. SAYAR in *Journal of Near Eastern Studies*, X (1951), 274.

⁵ KÖPRÜLÜ/BOUVAT, *op. cit.*, 255.

⁶ *Ibid.*, 258.

⁷ *Ibid.*, 261.

⁸ *Ibid.* J. R. WALSH adds in "Yünus Emre . . .", pp. 183-4, that "In his *dīvân* we also have charming nativity hymns on the birth of the Prophet, and the Mother Goddess theme is represented by the praises of the Prophet's daughter Fātima, the martyrdom of Husayn . . ."

⁹ KÖPRÜLÜ/BOUVAT, *op. cit.*, 263. KÖPRÜLÜ argues against the views of Rizâ Tevfik who believed such a relation did exist. See his "Étude sur la religion des Houroufis" in *Textes persan relatifs à la secte des Houroufis*, G. M. S., IX (1909), pp. 221-313.

Baraq Bābā, disciple of Sarī Saltuq (who in turn was a disciple of Hāggī Bektāš), exercised great influence at the Ilhānid court of the Sultāns Gāzān and Ulgaitū. Both Baraq and Saltuq are two very important figures in the religious history of Anatolia (and even of Rumeli) during the thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries¹. Baraq Bābā's feats before the Mongol Sultān Gāzān, unbelievable though they may seem, did not go unnoticed by the Mamlūk writers and biographers². Ibn Haġar al-Asqalāni (d. 852/1448), for example, tells us at the end of his biography of Baraq that he was sent with the Mongol army against Gilān where he was imprisoned and boiled to death in a large kettle³.

The Bektāši order, on the other hand, was perhaps more a descendant of the teachings of Bābā Ishāq and the Bābā'is than of Yūnus Emre. In any case, heretical tendencies (both Muslim and Christian) were rampant in the Order, which came into great prominence during the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. R. TSCHUDI, in a recent article, sums up this aspect of Bektāšism as follows: "In their secret doctrines, (the Bektāšis) are Shi'is, acknowledging the Twelve Imāms and, in particular, holding Dja'far al-Şadıķ in high esteem. The center of their worship is 'Ali; they unite 'Ali with Allāh and Muḥammad into a trinity."⁴

Finally, the story of the turbulent life and ideas of Saīh Badr ad-Din ibn Qādi Samāwnā is perhaps the highest point of the social unrest in Anatolia during the late fourteenth and early fifteenth centuries. Badr ad-Din, following a traditional Muslim career which took him from Edirne to Bursa, Qonya, Jerusalem, Cairo, Mecca and Tabriz (in 805/1402-3 – "possibly attracted by the fame of the Ṣafawiyya in Ardabil"⁵ – where he narrowly escaped being drafted by Timūr who was on his way back from Anatolia), "gradually developed into an open heretic: he propagated the idea of common ownership . . . (and) became connected (in ways which are not yet clear) with the communist underground movement of a certain Bürklüdjé Mustafa, and a certain Torlak Hu Kemal, which led to the extensive rebellion in 1416, as whose ideological head Badr al-Din appears."⁶ The movement was very cruelly suppressed, and many of Badr ad-Din's followers found refuge in other movements such as the Sūfi Order at Ardabil and the Bektāšis⁷.

¹ KÖPRÜLÜ, "Influence du Chamanisme . . .", 14-19; P. WITTEK, "Yazijioglu 'Ali on the Christian Turks of the Dobruja", *BSOAS* XIV (1952), 658-659; Fr. Babinger, "Sarī Saltık Dede", *EI*, 1st edition; Ibn Baṭṭūṭa in his *Rihlah*, 345/GIBB's transl., II, 499-500, says, "They relate that this Saltuq was an ecstatic devotee, although things are told of him which are reproved by the Divine Law."

² B. LEWIS, "Baraq Bābā" (bibliography), *EI*, new edition.

³ Ibn Haġar al-Asqalāni, *ad-Durar al-kāmina*, I, 473-474, biography No. 1277. According to Faşħi, *Mugħmal*, III, p. 15 (events of the year 706/1306-7), Ulgaitū made preparations for the conquest of Gilān and that in the next year (III, 16) Baraq died in Gilān, was carried back to Sultānyā and buried there.

⁴ R. TSCHUDI, "Bektāshīyya", *EI*, new edition. See also J. K. BIRGE, *The Bektashi Order of Dervishes* (London and Hartford 1937), 50-51, and p. 67, n. 2, where he says that "according to Bektashi tradition both (Sultan) Selim and (Şah) Ismail were initiated members of the order"; and M. F. KÖPRÜLÜ, *Les origines du Bektachisme* (Essai sur le développement historique de l'hétérodoxie musulmane en Asie Mineure), ext. des *Actes du Congrès internationale d'Histoire des Religions* tenu à Paris en 1923.

Aḥmad Taškōprū-zādē (901-969/1495-1561) in his *as-Saqdīq an-Nu'māniya* (on the margin of Ibn Ḥalikān's *Wafayāt al-A'yān*, Būlāq, 1300/1882), vol. I, p. 83, states:

وقد انتسب اليه في زماننا هذا بعض من الملاحدة نسبة كاذبة وهو روى منهم بـ

⁵ H. J. KISSLING, "Badr al-Din b. Kādi Samāwna", *EI*, new edition, and Fr. BABINGER, "Schejch Bedr ed-Din, der Sohn der Richters von Simaw", *Der Islam*, XI (1921), 78 ff.

⁶ *Ibid.* (KISSLING), and cf. von HAMMER-PURGSTALL, *Histoire de l'Empire Ottoman* (transl. J. J. HELLELT), II, 181: "Cette insurrection, l'une des plus dangereuses qui aient été tentées dans l'empire ottoman, est aussi l'une des plus extraordinaires en ce que les complices cachèrent leurs perfides desseins sous le masque du fanatisme religieux, et en préparèrent l'exécution avec une patience et une habileté suprenantes."

⁷ The traditional account on Badr ad-Din has been narrated by von HAMMER-PURGSTALL, *op. cit.* II, 156 ff. But for an up to date bibliography see KISSLING's article in *EI*, new edition, and M. Şerefeddin

This, it should be remembered, coincided with the period that followed the defeat at Ankara, during which time the political situation in Anatolia and throughout the Ottoman possessions was perhaps at its most confused and disorderly stage. It was the period of the civil war between Bâyezid I's sons and the final reconquest of Anatolia under Mehmed II.

To sum up: the state of Islam in Anatolia during the formative years of the Ottoman empire is perhaps the thorniest knot to unravel in medieval Ottoman history. From Ǧalāl ad-Dīn Rūmī at the court of the later Rûm Selḡûqs all the way to the period of Sultân Selim I at the height of Ottoman power, the religious conditions in Anatolia appear to have been governed by three basic factors which, although difficult to assess factually, are still quite readily discernible. These factors tend to complicate the details, but the general picture that emerges at the end is quite clear. These factors are: (a) the position of orthodox *Sunnî* Islam both in the urban centers and among the Ottoman *gâzîs* along the western marches; (b) the tremendous influence of the *Süfi* orders and mystic leaders with their undefined egalitarian ideas among the unsettled Turkish tribes in the rural areas; and (c) the gradual emergence through a process of gradual growth and infiltration of *šî'i* ideas in one form or another. All this was taking place against a background of the indigenous Christianized population of Anatolia and the influx of large Turko-Mongolian elements from the East.

These factors cannot, and in fact need not, be considered separately, since none of them was actually operative independently at any given period. They appear to have been intermingled, and their effects were cross-sectional. The outcome, however, appears quite clear: that progressively *Šî'ism* in its popular forms was growing in the peninsula. This growth received strong impetus from the *šî'i* propaganda of the later leaders of the *Süfi* Order at Ardabil. This propaganda began first as a *Süfi* conversion and grew in the second half of the fifteenth century under the later Ṣafawids, Ǧunaid and Haidar, into a *Šî'i-Qizâibâs* movement that swept most of eastern Anatolia, which by the end of the century was predominantly a *šî'i* country¹.

6. *Šî'ism and the post-Mongol Dynasties*

For a short period during the first decade of the fourteenth century, *iqnâ'aṣârî* *Šî'ism* was declared the official religion of the Ilhânid state. That occurred in the reign of Ulḡaitû Ḥudâbanda; and the *iqnâ'aṣârî* scholar who played a signal role in the turn of events at that time was Ibn al-Muṭahhar al-Hilli². However, the Ilhânid government establishment reverted to Sunnism soon after Ulḡaitû died, and Muslim orthodoxy appears to have resumed the traditional position it had enjoyed during the pre-Mongol caliphal period.

Under the post-Ilhânid successor states, the exact relation between *iqnâ'aṣârîsm* and the ruling dynasties is nowhere clear. *Šî'i* writers assert that many of these dynasties, particularly the Čubânis, Ǧalâyirs, Sarbadârs, and Qara-qoyunlus, professed *imâmi* views³. To these one can add the lesser known Artuqid dynasty in Mardin and its environs⁴.

YALTKAYA, "Bedreddin" in *IA*, and I. H. UZUNÇARŞILI, *Osmâni Tarihi*, I. Cild, 2. baskı, (Ankara 1961) p. 360 fl.: "Samavna kadisoğlu Şeyh Bedreddin vak'ası."

¹ N. JORGA, *Geschichte des osmanischen Reiches*, vol. II (Gotha 1909), p. 327, n. 1.: "Über die Ausbreitung des Schiismus in neuer fanatischer Form siehe einen venezianischen Bericht vom 8. April 1514: 'Se puol dir i quattro quinti de tutta la Natolia'." (See references to this statement in BABINGER, "Schejch Bedr ed-Din . . .", p. 91, and MINORSKY, "Bâli-Efendi . . .", p. 438, n. 4).

² See above, Chapter III, p. 27 ff.

³ Muḥsin AL-AMIN, *A'ydn aṣ-Šî'a*, VII, 270-72 (biography No. 1120).

⁴ On the Artuqids see C. L. CAHEN, "Artukids", *EI*, new edition, and LANE-POOLE, *The Mohammadan Dynasties*, 166-69. The Mardin branch of this dynasty submitted to Timur and was subsequently absorbed

It is certain, however, that *iṣnā'aṣārī* scholars, following in the steps of Ibn al-Muṭahhar, persisted in their attempts to "convert" the ruling dynasts and win them over to "high Sī'ism". One such attempt was made by the leading *imāmī* scholar of his time, Ahmad ibn Fahd al-Hilli (d. 841/1437), who entered into a religious contest at Bağdād with Sunni scholars at the court of Ispand, son of Qara-Yūsuf (and brother of Ğahān-Şāh Qara-qoyunlu), governor of Iraq from 836/1433 to 848/1445, and won over them, whereby the governor adopted *iṣnā'aṣārīsm* as the provincial state religion¹.

It is not clear how long this "conversion" lasted – perhaps throughout the ten or twelve years when Ispand was governor in Bağdād, perhaps even much less than that. It appears though that this was in essence a personal matter which involved individual rulers or specific members of the dynasties in power. Often the adoption of the new faith was not accompanied by a formal announcement, nor was the new religion imposed on the subjects of the ruler concerned. In some cases, it is a matter of inference, such as, for example, the fact that Hasan-i Buzurg (the founder of the Ğalāyirs, d. 757/1356) chose Nağaf as his last resting place – a possible indication that he was himself an *iṣnā'aṣārī*². His opponent, Amīr Čubān, the leading Mongol figure during the sultanate of the last Ilhānid Abū Sa'id, was carried for burial all the way to Medina in the proximity of the Prophet's tomb³. Several junior members of the Ğalāyir family also showed an affinity to Sī'ism in some form or another⁴. But a seal of Sultān Ahmād, the chief representative of this dynasty, shows no particular deviations from Sunni orthodoxy⁵. It must be said in passing that many rulers and royal princes of these dynasties led most unexemplary lives, paying the least attention to Islamic religious duties – a matter which caused later chroniclers to ascribe all kinds of heretical tendencies to them. These reports, however, cannot be fully trusted⁶.

As for Timūr, his religious views are difficult to define. There is no doubt that he was opportunistic when it came to religious controversies⁷. Including him among *a'yān aṣ-Sī'a* is vacuous⁸, and the most balanced evaluation of him in this respect is by someone who knew

by the Qara-qoyunlus in 811/1408. The court poet of the dynasty, Ṣaff ad-Dīn al-Hilli (d. 749/1348) – perhaps the last of the famous Arab poets of the classical period – was an *iṣnā'aṣārī* Sī'i. See the remarks on him by al-Fīrūzābādī, the author of *al-Qāmūs*, and others in the introduction to al-Hilli's *al-Kitāb al-ṣāfi al-ḥāfi wal-murāḥħas al-ḡālī* (*Die vulgärarabischen Poetik . . . des Safiyaddin Hilli*, ed. W. HOENERBACH, Wiesbaden 1956). Fīrūzābādī says that al-Hilli "was a pure Sī'i". Cf. Hwānsārī, *Rauḍat al-ḡannāt*, on Ṣaff ad-Dīn al-Hilli, known as Ibn as-Sarāyā, p. 422–423.

¹ Sūstārī, *Maqālis*, 241; Hwānsārī, *Rauḍat*, 20–21; *Nāma-yi Dānišwārān-i Nāṣirī*, I, 374–75; and others.

² al-Ahrī (or Aharī), Abū Bakr, *Tārīħ-i Saīb Uvays*, ed. J. B. VAN LOON, The Hague 1954, Introduction, p. 11. The editor also notes 'Alid tendencies in the choice of names by members of the Ğalāyir dynasty, such as 'All, Hasan, and Husain. See also Muhsin AL-AMĪN, *A'yān aṣ-Sī'a*, VII, 270–71, and XIII, 80.

³ Faṣḥī, *Muġmal*, III, 37–39 (events of the year 728/1327–28); BROWNE, *LHP*, III, 51–56; and Ibn Battūṭa, *Rihla*, 227 ff./GIBB's transl., II, 335 ff.

⁴ Ibn Ḥāgar, *ad-Durār*, I, 126, and II, 14; Ibn Taġrībirdī, *al-Manhal aṣ-Ṣāfi*, I, 232–40; as-Sahāwī, *ad-Dā'u al-lāmi'*, I, 244–45; AL-AMĪN, *A'yān aṣ-Sī'a*, XIV, 227–228.

⁵ Muhammad Qazwīnī, *Yādīgār*, I (1944), No. 4: 26, 28; and H. MASSÉ, *JA* (1938), 465–68. The seal as reproduced in Qazwīnī carried the names of the Four Caliphs in the corners, and the circular inscription on it reads in part:

وَاللَّهِ أَكْبَرُ وَحْدَهُ لَا شَرِيكَ لَهُ . . . لَا إِلَهَ مَعْنَاهُ وَرَسُولُهُ

⁶ For short biographies on the post-Ilhānid rulers see Gaffārī, *Ğahānārā*, 215–17 on the Ğalāyirs, 217–219 on the Čubānids, and 247–51 on the Qara-qoyunlus. (The section on the Qara-qoyunlus has been translated into English by MINORSKY, "Jihān-Shāh . . .", 292–297. For more recent articles see R. M. SAVORY, "Čubānids", and J. M. SMITH, Jr., "Djalāyir, Djalāyirid", in *EI*, new edition.

⁷ BARTHOLD/MINORSKY, *Four Studies on the History of Central Asia*, I, 59.

⁸ Muhsin AL-AMĪN in *A'yān aṣ-Sī'a*, XIV, 236–305, biography No. 2782, devotes 70 odd pages to Timūr but says next to nothing about Timūr's Sī'ism or lack of it!

him. Ibn Ḥaldūn, who had a most memorable meeting with Timūr in Damascus in 803/1400, says: "This king Timūr is a leader among kings and pharaohs. Some believe he was a learned man; while others think he was a *rāfiḍī* since they see that he prefers the members of the Prophet's family. Still others feel he believed in magic. (The truth of the matter is that) he is none of these. He is extremely intelligent and clever; and he is a great seeker after the things he knew and the things he did not know."¹ And while Timūr's successors in Māwarā'annahr were great champions of Sunni orthodoxy, his other "successors" in Iraq and Ādharbaigān, the Qara-qoyunlu dynasty, showed more affinity to *Sī'ism*, perhaps even to a much greater degree than the Ḡalāyirs who were their "predecessors" in this area. For while the Ḡalāyirs may have shown a definite likeness to the cause of *iṣnā' asāri* *Sī'ism*, the Qara-qoyunlu leaders appear to have gone a step further and landed in the region of extreme heterodoxy.

Pīr Budāq, son of Ğahān-Şāh, for example, is described in the sources as having been a *šī'i* of dissolute religious character², while another son, Hasan-'Ali, who rebelled against his father and took refuge with Uzūn Hasan of the Aq-qoyunlus, is said to have been driven away from the Aq-qoyunlu court "on account of certain heretical opinions ascribed to him."³ Later Armenian sources describe this Hasan-'Ali as a cynical and evil man, a thief and a brigand who pillaged the region near Mt. Ararat⁴.

Ğahān-Şāh himself, the strongest and ablest representative of the Qara-qoyunlu dynasty, was not spared in this respect. The contemporary al-Ğiyāṭī in his *Tārīḥ* describes him in most unglowing terms⁵, while Sahāwi in *ad-Dau' al-lāmī'*, after acknowledging his greatness as a monarch, states that "like his relatives and brothers, (Ğahān-Şāh) was not tied down to any religious creed."⁶ Fadl Allāh ibn Rūzbihān Ḥunġī while praising his patrons the Aq-qoyunlu, damns their predecessors: "They never succumbed to wrong deeds, as did many of the Qara-qoyunlu who, through bad dispositions and association with heretics, reached the brink of Hell."⁷

More significant than all this is the substantive study made by V. MINORSKY of Ğahān-Şāh and his poetry⁸. MINORSKY places Ğahān-Şāh and the Qara-qoyunlus within the context of

¹ Ibn Ḥaldūn, *at-Ta'rīf* . . . , ed. Muḥammad ibn Tawīt ܣܾ-ܴܶܰܵ, Cairo, 1951, p. 382. Cf. W. J. FISCHER, *Ibn Khaldūn and Tamerlane*, (Un. of California 1952), p. 47. On Timūr's discussions of religious topics (including *Sī'ism*) see Niẓām ad-Dīn Šāmī, *Zafarnāma* (ed. F. TAUER), I, 277; and the long description by Muḥammad ibn aš-Šihna, *Raudat al-mandāṣir* (published on the margins of vol. 11 and 12 of *Ibn al-Aṭīr, al-Kāmil*, Cairo 1303/1885), vol. 12, p. 190 ff.

² Sahāwi, *ad-Dau' al-lāmī'*, vol. III, p. 2. Muhsin AL-AMĪN, *A'yān*, XIV, 166, states on the authority of Suṣtarī's *Maġālis* that Pīr Budāq wore a ring with *šī'i* poetry inscribed on it – an indication of his being himself a *šī'i*.

³ BROWNE, *LHP*, III, 408.

⁴ M. BROSSSET (transl.), *Collection d'Historiens Arméniens*, vol. II (St. Pétersbourg 1876), "Memoires historiques sur les Sofis", p. 4.

⁵ al-Ğiyāṭī, *Tārīḥ*, pp. 260, 261, and 263:

وكان جهانشاه يستعمل الأفرين ، ذر خيالات فاسدة مدح المقل والتدبر فاسد التفكير . . . ما كان في قلب خرد خوف من الله تعالى . . . لم يذكر الله تعالى بشارة ولا لسان ولم يسبده الله يوما الى (لا/sic) في خلوة ولا في ميان. ويا ليت كان على هذا الحال من غير ظلم وفجور فإن الله رسم غفور . . . لكن ظلمه ونكره الفاسد أخرب البلاد وأباد العباد.

⁶ Sahāwi, *ad-Dau'*, III, 80. BROWNE, *LHP*, III, 403, quoting from Munaggimbāšī, *Sahā'i al-abbār*, says, Ğahān-Şāh was "a dissolute, immoral, blood-thirsty tyrant, a malignant inclined to heresy and atheism, who paid no heed to the sacred law, passed his nights until dawn in revelry and vice, and slept like a dog during the day . . ." Armenian sources speak of his respect to Christians; see BROSSSET, *op. cit.*, p. 5.

⁷ Ḥunġī/MINORSKY, *Tārīḥ-i 'Alam-Ārd-yi Amīnī*, 21.

⁸ MINORSKY, "Jihān-Şāh Qara-qoyunlu and his Poetry", (*Turkmenica*, 9), *BSOAS*, 16 (1954), pp. 271-97.

extreme *šī'i* movements during the fifteenth century, namely, "Revols in Anatolia, the propaganda of Faḍlullāh the Ḥurūfi, the Mahdism of the Muṣha'ša' in Southern Iraq, the deep penetration of Safavi agents into Asia Minor, and possibly the final formation of the Ahl-i ḥaqq doctrine . . .", and concludes, "With regard to the Qara-qoyunlu, the evidence is clear that they pretended to something more than dominion based on sheer force and that, in trying to unify their adepts on a *shī'a* platform, they can be regarded as the forerunners of the Safavids."¹ However, on Čahān-Šāh and his Šī'ism MINORSKY says that "only on close examination can one discover in the poems a tinge of Shi'ite feelings and terminology²." His *tahallus*, "Haqiqi", is in strict Süfi fashion.

On some of Čahān-Šāh's coinage the *šī'i* formula "'Ali is the wali of Allāh" does appear, but almost always the names of the Four Caliphs are also found on the reverse of the coins³.

Broadly speaking therefore, one can safely state that, during the period of the post-Ilbānid dynasties, there were signs that Šī'ism was the favored form of Islam. These signs extended from simple reverence of the Prophet's family to open *rāfi'* and extreme views. However, no formal total adherence to *iqnā'ašari* Šī'ism can be noted; and perhaps the following general statement by M. Jean AUBIN is a good summation of the way many of the rulers of these dynasties chose to win over the allegiance of their subjects: "La question se pose de savoir quelle pouvait être l'attitude des dynasties turkmènes devant la montée du chiisme. Espérant pouvoir canaliser cette force, les souverains ne la heurtaient que lorsqu'elle devenait un péril. Le problème n'était pas pour les Qara Qonyunlu ou les Aq Qonyunlu de se montrer hostiles ou favorables au chiisme, mais d'adopter une politique qui leur garantit un large support parmi leur sujets."⁴

Far more serious, however, is the involvement of *iqnā'ašari* Šī'ism with such extreme groups ("dynasties" is too formal an appellation) as the Sarbadārs in Ḫurāsān and the Muṣa'ša's in southern Iraq during the times of the two leading *iqnā'ašari* thinkers Muḥammad ibn Makki al-'Āmili and Ahmad ibn Fahd al-Ḥilli. For here there appears to have been an attempt made on the part of "high Šī'ism" to appeal to forms that can definitely be described as heretical.

A. *Ibn Makki and the Sarbadārs*

The story of Muḥammad ibn Makki al-'Āmili, "aš-Šahid al-Awwal", has been told many times in *iqnā'ašari* *tezkerēs*⁵, and so was the tempestuous history of the "communistic" Sarbadārs in many chronicles⁶. On the one hand, we have an *iqnā'ašari* scholar who grew up in the best tradition of the high *imāmi* school which goes back to Ibn al-Muṭahhar and long before, and on the other we have a group of adventurers who established a "state" along the eastern Iranian marches (around the city of Baihaq/Sabzawār), egged on by popular Süfi

¹ *Ibid.*, 273-274.

² *Ibid.*, 281; two instances are given here with possible reference to Hazrat-i 'Ali. Čahān-Šāh's poems are in Persian and Turkish. See also A. BOMBACI, *Storia della letteratura Turca* (Napoli 1956), 233-39. chapter entitled "Sovrani poeti" on Ahmad Galayir, Čahān-Šāh and Sāh Ismā'il.

³ Richard BURN, "Coins of Jahān Shāh Kara Koyunlu and some contemporary rulers", *The Numismatic Chronicle and Journal of the Roy. Numismatic Society*, 5th ser., No. 71 (1938), 173-197. Cf. MINORSKY's note on Qara-qoyunlu coinage in "Jihān-Shāh . . .", 279 and n. 5; and 'Azzāwī, *Tārīh an-nuqūd al-'Irāqiyya* (Bagdād 1377/1958), 80 ff.

⁴ J. AUBIN, "Note", 125-33.

⁵ Sūstarī, *Muġālis*, 241; Maġlisī, *Bihār*, I, Introduction, 119-123; Māmaqānī, *Tanqīh al-maqdī*, III, 191-2; 'Abbās Qummi, *Fawd'id ar-rasawīya*, 645-53, and others.

⁶ Faṣīḥī, *Muġmal*, III, 50-51; Ḥwāndamīr, *Habib*, III, 356 ff.; Mirhwānd, *Rauḍat as-safā*, V, 624; Iṣfārī, *Rauḍat al-ğannātī*, II, 8 ff.; Hāfiẓ-i Abrū, "Tārīh-i umarā'-yi Sarbadāriya . . ." (in F. TAUER, *Cinq opuscules de Hāfiẓ-i Abrū*, Prague 1959), 15-26; and Ibn Baṭṭūṭa, *Rihla*, 383-385.

leaders (beginning with Šaih Ḥalifa, and going through Ḥasan Ĝuri, Darwîš 'Aziz, and Darwîš Rukn ad-Din)¹, and took it upon themselves to impose justice through tyranny. The contact between the two came during the reign of the last Sarbadâr ruler 'Ali Mu'ayyad (766–788/1364–1386) and in the last years of Ibn Makki's life (killed 786/1384).

The correspondence between the Sarbadâr ruler and the Sūfi scholar was started by the former, who invited Ibn Makki to come to Ḥurâṣân to assist in the establishment of *iḥnā'ašari* Šī'ism². Ibn Makki could not make the trip since he was already involved in a struggle for his life in Damascus with certain groups who had accused him of heretical ideas³. While in prison waiting the outcome of his trial, Ibn Makki wrote (in seven days, we are told) *al-Lum'a al-Dimâqṣiya*, an important work on *imāmi* fiqh, and sent it to Sabzavâr with the Sultân's messenger⁴.

There appears to have been no doubt that Ibn Makki's involvement with powers outside Mamlûk Syria was reason enough for his execution⁵. With his death and the end of the Sarbadâr state shortly afterwards, the experiment of establishing an *iḥnā'ašari* state in eastern Irân failed. In many ways, Šâh Ismâ'il was the successor who put 'Ali Mu'ayyad's attempt into effect a little more than a century later in Ādarbaigân⁶.

B. *Ibn Fahd and the Muša'šas*

With Aḥmad ibn Fahd al-Hilli⁷, the contacts between *iḥnā'ašari* Šī'ism and extremist religious ideas of the *gulât* type were much stronger.

¹ On the role of these *sūfi* leaders in Sarbadâr history see I. P. PETRUSHEVSKII, "Nahdat-i Sarbadârân dar Ḥurâṣân", transl. by Karim KİŞLÂWARZ, in *Farhang-i Irân-samîn*, 10 (1962), pp. 124–224. (The article originally appeared as "Dvizenie Serbedarov v Khorasane" in *Uchënie Zapiski Instituta Vostokovedenia*, v. 14 (Moscow 1956). BROWNE's "Husayn Jûrî" in *LHP*, III, 178, should be corrected to "Ḥasan Jûrî".

² See text of letter reproduced by Muhammed Ridâ Šams ad-Dîn in his *Hayât al-Imâm as-Sâhid al-Awwâl*, an-Nâqâf, 1376/1957, pp. 4–5, and 59, n. 2. The authenticity of this letter needs to be established. According to Šams ad-Dîn, the correspondence was begun when Ibn Makki was in Baġdâd. See also 'Abdâl Iqbâl, *Târîħ*, 466.

³ The original story on the death of Ibn Makki is ascribed to his student al-Miqdâd as-Suyûfî (who is also a teacher of Ibn Fahd al-Hilli). Miqdâd died in 826/1423; on him see ZIRIKLI, *A'lâm*, VIII, 207, s. v. "al-Miqdâd al-Hilli"; KAHHÂLA, *Mu'gam*, XII, 318, s. v. "al-Miqdâd al-Suyûfî"; and GAL, Suppl. II 209. The story is preserved in Mağlîl, *Bîhâr*, vol. 25, p. 38 (of the lith. edition, 1303?/1885? Volumes 25–26 of the *Bîhâr*, being the last two books of the lith. edition, are referred to as *İğâzât al-Bîhâr*). The dramatized form of the story in Šams ad-Dîn, *Hayât*, is a faithful rendering of the original with the exception that the use of *taqîya* by Ibn Makki is left out in *Hayât*, pp. 75–77. The Miqdâd story is also mentioned in Tunakâbunî, *Qisâs*, 340–41 in the biography of as-Sâhid al-Awwâl. See also Ḥwânsârî *Rawdât*, 127–29, and Sulaimân Dâhi'r, "Silat al-'ilm bayn Dîmaq wa-Ğabal 'Amîl", *Mağallat al-Mâgma'* al-'Ilmi al-'Arabi, IX, (Damascus 1929), 269–79 and 341–354.

⁴ Zain ad-Dîn al-'Amîl, "as-Sâhid at-Tâ'i" (d. 966/1558), *ar-Rauda al-Bâhiya bi-Şark al-Lum'a ad-Dimâqṣiya*, (lith. Tabriz 1275–76/1858–59), p. 5.

⁵ Šams ad-Dîn, *Hayât*, 74.

⁶ PETRUSHEVSKII in his long monograph on the Sarbadârs (see above n. 1) oddly enough does not make any mention of the relation between 'Ali Mu'ayyad and the Sūfi scholar Ibn Makki. Apparently he does not see that Mu'ayyad wanted to stabilize his rule by adopting an established religion (i. e. *iḥnâ'ašarîya*) rather than keep the country under the influence of the dervishes mentioned above. Did this not fit into PETRUSHEVSKII's scheme of things? Jean AUBIN puts it a little differently in his "Tamerlan à Bagdâd", *Arabica*, IX, 306: "Ménacés par le radicalisme des couches populaires, les chefs sarbadârs s'étaient ralliés d'enthousiasme à Tamerlan, dont les convictions sunnites étaient nourries, avant tout, de conservatisme religieux et social." MINORSKY however believes that "the republic of Sabzavâr . . . was still another example of the democratic traditions with which this form of heterodoxy was inspired on Persian soil." See his "Iran: Opposition, Martyrdom, and Revolt" in *Unity and Variety*, p. 192.

⁷ On Aḥmad ibn Fahd al-Hilli see (in addition to p. 64, note 1) Mağlîl, *Bîhâr*, I, 199–203 of the

To begin with, Ibn Fahd, in addition to his having been the leading *imāmī* scholar of his time (his "conversion" of the Qara-qoyunlu governor in Bağdād to *iṣnā'ašarī* Si'ism has just been mentioned above p. 64), is described in șī'i biographical works as having himself entertained unconventional *șūfi* ideas of folk-Islamic nature which later *iṣnā'ašarīs* questioned¹. Further, he is said to have been conversant with the "strange sciences" (*al-'ulūm al-ġarība*, i. e. magic and miracle making) on which subject he also composed a small work², which he later wanted to destroy. His circle at Ḥilla was brilliant and was the meeting place of many scholars and students of *imāmī* thought³.

One of Ibn Fahd's more celebrated students was Muḥammad ibn Falāḥ known as al-Muša'šā'. (The other was the equally famous Muḥammad Nūrbahš the founder of the Nūrbahšiya *tariqa* in eastern Irān and Māwarā'annahr). Ibn Falāḥ must have been a special student of Ibn Fahd's inasmuch as the teacher married the student's widowed mother and gave his own daughter in marriage to him⁴.

After being well-grounded in the Muslim and șī'i sciences Ibn Falāḥ declared himself to be the Mahdi and claimed descent from the family of the Prophet⁵. We are told further that he made use of his teacher's book on miracles and magic and began to attract many adherents chiefly among the Arab tribes in the marshlands of southern Iraq, where after many years of wandering (including a suspicious sojourn at the old Ismā'ili center in Quhistān⁶) he estab-

Introduction; Māmaqāni, *Tanqīh al-maqdī*, I, 92–93; 'Abbās Qummī, *Fawā'id ar-Rarawīya*, 33–35; and *GAL*, II, 213 and Suppl. II, 210.

¹ Şūstarī, *Mağālis*, 241: «رسوف ومتاوض وصاحب ذوق وحال بود» and so does Mağlist in his *Bihār*, I, p. 200 of the Introduction. Bahārānī in *Lu'lū'at al-Bahraīn*, p. 155, says it more clearly:

وَفَاصْلَ عَالِمٍ فَقِيهٍ مُجْتَدِ زَادَهُ وَرَعَ تَقْرِئَنَّ لَأَنَّ لَهُ مِيَّازَ الْصَّوْفَةِ بِلَ تَفَوَّهُ بِهِ فِي بَعْضِ مَسْتَفَانَةِ

But 'Abd ar-Rahīm ar-Rabbānī aš-Šīrāzī, editor of *Bihār*, attempts to deny Ibn Fahd's inclination to Sūfism (vol. I, p. 200, n. 1 of the Introduction): – «لكن أبو علی الریاض نزه ساخته من ذلك فـ كتاب متى القال» Very few of Ibn Fahd's works are published. BROCKELMANN lists 13 books of which only one was published, and Mağlist lists 18 of which two only were published.

² 'Azzāwī, *Tārīħ*, III, 108; and Ḥwānsārī, *Rauḍāt*, 21.

³ One of Ibn Fahd's students, Šaih 'Alī ibn Muḥammad aṭ-Ṭā'ī, describes his teacher's circle of studies in an interesting poem quoted in Şūstarī, *Mağālis*, 241, and in *Nāma-yi Dānišvarān-i Nāṣirī*, I, 372–73.

⁴ 'Azzāwī, *Tārīħ*, III, 109–10, quoting from Ibn Ṣadqām, *Tuhfa al-azhār*. (On Ibn Ṣadqām see ZIRIKLI, *A'lām*, II, 232, KAHĀNĀLA, *Mu'ğam*, III, 251, and *GAL*, Suppl., II, 599. However, none of these sources mentions the *Tuhfa*.)

⁵ The genealogy is given in 'Azzāwī, *Tārīħ*, III, 108:

وَمُحَمَّدُ بْنُ فَلاحُ بْنُ هَبَّةِ اللَّهِ بْنِ حَسْنٍ بْنِ عَلِيِّ الْمُرْتَضِيِّ بْنِ عَبْدِ الْحَمِيدِ النَّسَابِيِّ بْنِ أَبِي مُخَارَبٍ بْنِ أَحْمَدِ بْنِ أَبِي الْقَاسِمِ مُحَمَّدِ بْنِ أَبِي عَبِيدِ اللَّهِ الْجَنْدِيِّ بْنِ الْحَسِينِ بْنِ مُحَمَّدِ بْنِ إِبرَاهِيمِ الْحَابِبِ بْنِ مُحَمَّدِ الْمَالِكِ الصَّالِحِ بْنِ الْإِمامِ مُوسَى الْكَاظِمِ

The list in Şūstarī, *Mağālis*, 403, is essentially the same. Only part of this genealogy, extending to the seventh generation of Abū 'Alī Fahār, could be verified from the detailed lists given in Rauzātī, *Gāmi' al-ansāb*, I, 23 and 26 (of the text).

⁶ Ibn Falāḥ is said to have gone – or perhaps been invited – to Quhistān in 800/1397 to officiate at the unearthing of the tomb of a local saint (Mazār al-Ḥāmidīllāh 'Alawī). According to *Tārīħ-i Husāmī*, he assisted in the building of a *qubba* on the shrine and left one of his companions, Darwīsh Husain, in charge before returning to Iraq. See 'Āyatī, *Bahāristān* . . . 151–52. According to *Tārīħ-i Ča'farī* (written in 851–856/1447–52 by Ča'far ibn Muḥammad Husainī – on him see Storey, 86 and 1235), Sayyid Muḥammad ibn Falāḥ is said to have gone . . . «وَرَدَ مَطْبَعُ نَلَسْفَهُ رَاسِمَيْلِهِ عَلَى مِيكَرَد» – See J. AUBIN, "Deux Sayyids", 380, n. 2. (The biographical sections of this *Tārīħ* have been published by Iraj AFŞAR in "Çand faşl az Tārīħ-i Kabīr", *Farhang-i Irān-zāmin*, VI, (1337/1959) pp. 89–94 (muqaddima), and 95–158 (text). Moreover a hitherto unpublished Ph. D. thesis of Mainz University should be mentioned here: 'Abbas ZARYAB, *Der Bericht über die Nachfolger Timurs aus dem Tārīħ-i Kābir des Ča'farī ibn Muḥammad al-Husainī* (Mainz 1960).

lished himself in Huwaiza¹. The success of his movement was partly due to the fact that his headquarters in Hūzistān was remote from the authority of the central government in Bağdād and Tabriz. The attraction of the Arab tribes in southern Iraq to the Muša'šā' movement is a curious thing in itself (since Sī'ism was not the sole domain of the Iranians), but there are no indications that it should be construed as a separatist and nationalist move on the part of Ibn Falāh and his followers².

Ibn Fahd tried to curb the excesses of his student and son-in-law but was denounced by him³. In fact, after establishing himself in southern Iraq, Ibn Falāh tried to be friendly with the Qara-qoyunlu governors in Bağdād who saw his usefulness against the Timūrid governor in Fārs. However, when the Muša'šā' movement grew beyond control, particularly when under Ibn Falāh's son, Maulā 'Ali, Muša'šā' bands began to harass the pilgrimage routes in southern Iraq, the Qara-qoyunlu moved to curb the Muša'šā's, and Maulā 'Ali was killed in an engagement with a Qara-qoyunlu army sent against him in 861/1456-57⁴.

Ibn Falāh outlived his son by a few years and died in 866/1461. His extreme religious views are preserved in a work known as *Kalām al-Mahdi*, a work which encompasses the secret doctrines of the Muša'šā' movement⁵.

¹ On Huwaiza see *Farhang-i ḡuṛāfiyād-yi Irān*, VI, 371; KAIHĀN, II 466-476 (on Hūzistān); Yāqūt, "al-Huwaiza", (his description throws very interesting light on the unruly character of its inhabitants); Qazwīnī, *Nuzhal*, Persian text 110-111 (English translation, LIE STRANGE, 109); Ibn Baṭṭūṭa, *Rihla*, 218/ GIBB's translation, II, 321-22; and *Tārīh-i ḡuṛāfiyād-yi Hūzistān*, 240-42 (where two Huwaizas are distinguished). Sūštarī, *Maġālis*, 30, depends chiefly on Yāqūt. Huwaiza became an important center of Sī'ī learning. See BROWNE on Ni'mat Allāh al-Jazā'īrī (*LHP*, IV, 360 ff.), and Tunakābūnī, *Qīṣāṣ al-'ulāmā*, 436 ff. See also several Huwaizi authors in Kantūrī, *Kaṣf al-huqūq wa al-aslār*.

² On the Muša'šā' movement in general see: The Persian chronicles (Hwāndamīr, *Habib*, IV, 497; Rūmlū, *Aḥsan*, I, 104; Qazwīnī, *Lubb*, 250; Gaffārī, *Gāhān-ārā*, 253, 272; Iskandar Munshī, *Tārīh-i 'ālam-ārā-yi 'Abbāsī*, I, 35; and the Anonymous History of Sāh Ismā'īl, Cambridge University Library MS. Add. 200, quoted in BROWNE, *LHP*, IV, 59) deal primarily with the Muša'šā' history contemporary with Sāh Ismā'īl. Ḥunqī, however, in *Tārīh-i 'ālam-ārā-yi Amīnī*, 46, 93, 98, deals with the rise of the Muša'šā' in the same vein in which he treats the Ṣafawid era of Ǧunaid and Ḥaidar. Abū Bakr Tīhrānī in *Tārīh-i Diyārbakrīya* (vol. I, ed. F. SÜMER) makes passing mention of "tugyān-i Muša'šā'" (p. 258) and "ilgār-i Muša'šā'" (p. 262), but gives no other details. The contemporary 'Irāqī chronicle *al-Tārīh al-Giyāṣī* is used extensively by 'Azzāwī, *Tārīh*, III, 109 ff. (For some unexplainable reason my photocopy of this manuscript lacks the sections on the Muša'šā' used by 'Azzāwī). Sūštarī, *Maġālis*, 403 ff., uses *Tārīh-i Giyāṣī*, while 'Abd Allāh ibn Nūr ad-Dīn's *Taqkira-yi Suštar*, p. 33 ff., is perhaps an independent source. Of the modern scholars who dealt with the subject of the Muša'šā's first mention should be made to Aḥmad KASRAWI's *Tārīh-i pañṣad sāla-yi Hūzistān*, *Muša'šā'iyan yā bahšī az tārīh-i Hūzistān* (see in this work, pp. 6-8 for several important sources used by KASRAWI), and his short work in Arabic *al-Taṣayyu' wa al-ṣī'a*. W. CASKEL wrote two articles on the subject: "Ein Mahdi des 15. Jahrhunderts. Sajid Muhammad ibn Falāh und seine Nachkommen", *Islamica*, IV (1929-31), 48-93; and "Die Wali's von Huwezeh", *Ibid.*, VI (1933-1934), 415-434. V. MINORSKY gave a good summary in the article "Musha'sha'", *EJ*, Supplement (1934). W. HINZ's short section on Muša'šā' bibliography in his "Quellenstudien zur Geschichte der Timuriden" *ZDMG*, 90 (1936), 396-98, added little to what was then written about this dynasty.

³ 'Azzāwī, *Tārīh*, III, 110.

⁴ Muša'šā' interference with the pilgrimage route drew the attention of the Egyptian historians who are important independant sources for the movement. See Ibn Iyās, *Baddī'i as-suhūr*, II, 45, 54, and 60; and Ibn Tagrī-birdī, *Hawdīd ad-duhūr* (ed. POPPER), Part 2, pp. 199, 249-250, and 305-306. (On the basis of these sources A. N. POLIAK wrote an article entitled "Les révoltes populaires en Égypte à l'époque des Mamelouks, et leurs causes économiques", *Revue des Études Islamiques*, VIII (1934). POLIAK, however, misunderstood and misread the name Ibn Falāh as "ibn al-fallāhī", i. e. "son of the peasant", and concluded that this was a revolt of the "fils du fellah" against the feudal lords. See his article pp. 255-56.)

⁵ KASRAWI appears to be the only scholar who discusses Ibn Falāh's *Kalām al-Mahdi*. See his *Muša'šā'iyan*, pp. 19-20, 26, and 22-23 (where he discusses the religious views of the Muša'šā's within the context

His son Maulā Muhsin, after having been accepted by Uzūn Ḥasan as "ruler" in Ḥūzistān, became belligerent during the period of relative unrest which followed the death of the great leader of the Aq-qoyunlus, and raided Bağdād in 883/1478. But when Sultān Ya'qūb, son of Uzūn Ḥasan, established himself he dispatched an army against Sultān Muhsin who was utterly defeated in 889/1484. Ya'qūb subsequently handled the affairs of the south very dexterously by forcing a wedge between Maulā Muhsin ("that Shaykh of the Polytheists", as Faḍl Allāh ibn Rūzbihān Ḥungī called him)¹ and his defecting son Sayyid Ḥasan who, however, had to send his own son to Tabriz as a hostage².

The Muša'šā' succession after Maulā Muhsin is not very clear in the sources or in the later authorities. The name Fayyād (or Fayyāz, depending on whether you are reading the Arabic or the Persian sources), who was either the brother or the son of Sultān Muhsin, was the Muša'šā' leader who met Shāh Ismā'il after the latter had conquered Bağdād in 914/1508-9 and was pressing southward against Ḥūzistān and Širāz. Two other sons of Muhsin, 'Ali and Ayyūb, are also given as the Muša'šā' leaders who attempted to make a stand against the Ṣafawid Shāh³. And as MINORSKY put it: "The two movements inevitably came into conflict . . . Besides, (Shāh Ismā'il) could hardly allow a rival Shi'a organization to persist."⁴

When Ismā'il left the area another son of Muhsin (Falah by name) regained control in Huwaiza, but his position was that of dependence on the Ṣafawid central government. With him the Muša'šā's as an independent "state" ceased to exist, and the era of the *wālis* of Huwaiza (or of Ḥūzistān or 'Arabistān) begins. Falah ibn Muhsin died in 920/1514.

However, for a long time, and inasmuch as the boundaries between the Ottoman empire and the Ṣafawid state remained by and large undefined, the *wālis* of Huwaiza were torn between the two powers⁵.

In *Tadkkirat al-Mulūk* (a work of the later Ṣafawid period) we are told: "The *wālis* in the provinces of Irān are four, whose names follow in the order of their importance and dignity. The first is the *wāli* of 'Arabistān, who is higher and more honoured than his colleagues, on account of his belonging to a sayyid family, his valour and the number of his tribes . . ."⁶

of 'All-Illāhism.) In a special "dunbāla" (*Muša'šā'iyyān*, 124-128) KASRAWI quotes at length from Ibn Falah's *Kalām*. The following is a good example:

بِسْمِ اللَّهِ الرَّحْمَنِ الرَّحِيمِ - الاعتقادُ أَنَّ عَلَيْهِ اللَّهِ بِحِبِّ الْبَيْتِ هُوَ السَّرُّ الدَّائِرُ فِي السَّمَاوَاتِ وَالْأَرْضِ وَمُحَمَّدُ (صَ) كَانَ هُوَ الْمَحَاجَبُ بَنْعَ الرِّسَالَةِ
وَالْأَحَدُ شَعْرُ امَامًا كَانُوا هُمُ الْمَلَكُوتُ مِنْهُمْ إِلَيْهِ وَمِنْهُمْ إِلَيْهِمْ. وَسَلَمَانُ مِنْ أَهْلِ الْبَيْتِ وَالْبَيْتِ هُوَ الطَّرِيقَةُ وَالْمَرْفَةُ وَكُلُّ مِنْ وَصَلَ إِلَيْهِ كَانَ
سَلَمَانٌ فِي كُلِّ عَصْرٍ وَزَمَانٍ. وَهُذَا السَّيِّدُ (أَيْ مُحَمَّدُ بْنُ فَلَاحٍ) الَّذِي ظَهَرَ هُوَ بِعِزَّتِهِ كُلُّ نَبِيٍّ وَكُلُّ ولٍ بِالنُّورِ الظَّاهِرِ وَضَعْفُ الْبَشَرِيَّةِ لَا
بِالْقُوَّةِ الْقَاهِرَةِ لَا تَتَنَقَّلُ بِلٍ يَنْتَقِلُ الْمَحَاجَبُ وَيَتَصَفُّ (هَذِهِ الْكَلِمَةُ غَيْرُ مَفْهُومَةٍ فِي الْأَصْلِ الْمُطَبَّعِ) الْبَدْنُ كَجَبَرِيلُ مَعَ تَشَكُّلِهِ
بَعْدَهُ أَبْدَانٌ مَعَ بَقَاءِ الْحَقِيقَةِ عَلَى حَالِهِ . . .

¹ Ḥungī/MINORSKY, *Tārīḥ-i 'Alam-ardā-yi Amīnī*, 84.

² 'Azzāwī, *Tārīḥ*, III, 272.

³ MINORSKY, "Muša'šā'", *EI*, first edition, Supplement, makes Fayyād the 3rd son of Muḥ. ibn Falah; CASKEL in "Ein Mahdi . . ." makes him the son of Muhsin, and has them both dying in the same year 914/1508; KASRAWI is for 'All and Ayyūb (*Muša'šā'iyyān*, 38-39); Ḥwāndamīr, *Habib*, IV, 497, is for Fayyād ibn Muhsin and describes a bloody battle between the Ṣafawids and the Muša'šā's; Azzāwī, *Tārīḥ*, III, 345, accepts Ḥwāndamīr's story.

⁴ MINORSKY, *loc. cit.*

⁵ On this part of Muša'šā' history see CASKEL, "Die Wali's von Huwezeh", *Islamica*, VI (1933-34), 415-434; and KASRAWI, *Muša'šā'iyyān*, 42 ff.

⁶ MINORSKY, *T. M.*, 44. The others are the *wālis* of Luristān, Georgia, and Kurdistān. The ruler of the Bahtiyārī tribe comes after them in importance.

A later governor, Sultân Mubârak (ibn 'Abd al-Mu'tâlib ibn Hâidar ibn Muhsin ibn Sayyid Muhammâd ibn Falâh), d. 1025/1616, "introduced the teaching of the Twelver Shi'a to Hawâza."¹

The two *imâmî* scholars (Ibn Makki and Ibn Fahd) whose attempts to establish Twelver Shi'ism have just been briefly reviewed, worked primarily within the context of traditional "high Shi'ism" of the *iñnâ'ašâri* persuasion. They cannot be blamed for the highly unorthodox and heretical views of the persons or groups with whom they came in contact – the *gûlât* Sarbadârs and the Mahdi Mušâ'šâ' extremists. Nor can traditional Shi'ism be expected to lead popular movements guided by undefined and heterodox ideas working outside and beyond legitimate means. Ibn Makki and Ibn Fahd, however, remain the leading *iñnâ'ašâri* scholars of their times. They can best be viewed, together with their immediate predecessor Ibn al-Mu'tâhhâr, as the three most important representatives of the *iñnâ'ašâri* school during the thirteenth-fifteenth centuries who constitute the missing link between the so-called "three early Muhammads" (Kulainî, Ibn Bâbawâih, and Tûsi "Sâlih at-Tâ'ifa") and the "three later Muhammads" of the high Sha'fawid period (al-Hurr al-'Âmili, Mullâ Muhsin-i Faïd, and Muhammâd Bâqîr Mağlisî)².

7. From Sâlih Gunaïd to Sâlih Ismâ'il: The Sha'fawid Movement

In sections 3 and 4 above, two phases of the history of the Şüfi Order at Ardabil were discussed, namely the predecessors of Sâlih Şâfi ad-Dîn, and the growth and development of the Order under its first four leaders: Sâlih Şâfi, Sâlih Sadr, Hwâga 'Ali, and Sâlih Ibrâhim. It was pointed out in the course of the discussion that while the Order was growing in importance and while its influence was spreading among the Turkmân tribes in Âdarbaiğân and Anatolia as well as in Hûrâsan, the heads of the Order remained essentially simple Şüfi *sâlihs* held in high esteem by their followers and honored by the ruling dynasties throughout the thirteenth-fifteenth centuries. It was further pointed out that no *shî'i* tendencies of any particular type (*iñnâ'ašâri*, *Is-mâ'ilî*, or *gûlât*) could be detected among the leaders of the Order or their followers beyond the special position which the family of the Prophet enjoyed at the level of folk-Islam.

A more or less true picture may be drawn from the following anecdote (whose historical worth and veracity may be questioned) to show this early state of affairs: Amîr Cübân, the most influential figure at the court of the last Ilhânî Sultân Abû Sa'id, is said to have once asked Sâlih Şâfi ad-Dîn, "Who are more numerous, your *murâids* or my men?" And Sâlih Şâfi is supposed to have answered, "In Irân today, for every man at arms there are one hundred men of devotion."³ The man of devotion died peacefully in his home town of Ardabil; Amîr Cübân led a hectic and tempestuous life, was finally strangled in Kurt territory at Herât, and his body carried in great pomp to Medina where he had chosen to be buried in the Prophet's city⁴.

Following the death of Sâlih Ibrâhim (whose leadership of the Order, as was pointed out, was singularly uneventful) a sudden and tremendous change occurred in the Order of Ardabil

¹ MINORSKY, "Mushâ'šâ'", *EI*, first edition, Supplement. Laurence LOCKHART's note on the *Mushâ'šâ'* in his *The Fall of the Safavid Dynasty and the Afghan Occupation of Persia* (Cambridge 1958), p. 5, n. 4 is misleading to say the least. In his statement (on p. 6) that "The *Mushâ'šâ'* Sayyids, like the majority of their Arab tribesmen, were Sunnis", the word "Sunni" must be a slip for "Shî'i"! Cf. M. B. DICKSON's review of LOCKHART's book in *JASOS*, 82 (1962), 514.

² On the "three early Muhammads" and the "three later Muhammads" and their works see BROWNE, *LHP*, IV, 358-59.

³ Gaffârî, *Gâhân-ârâ*, 260; and Amîn Ahmad Râzî, *Haft Iqlîm*, III, 253.

⁴ See above p. 64, note 3, and Ibn Haŷar al-'Asqalâni, *Durâr*, I, 541-42 (biography No. 1463). According to Bidîlî, *Saraf-nâma*, II, 118, Amîr Cübân "was one of the truest and greatest of Sâlih Şâfi ad-Dîn's *murâids*".

and its leaders. With the succession of Šaih Ğunaid the Order seemed to be transformed into a militant movement which, like a whirlwind, grew in intensity during the period of Ğunaid's son Haidar, and during Haidar's son Sultān 'Ali Pādišāh, and which finally carried Haidar's second son Ismā'il and seated him on the throne of the Ṣafawids at Tabriz. This development took less than half a century, and the phenomenon is very difficult to explain. The original sources are silent at this crucial moment in Ṣafawid history, and even if Muslim traditional historians are not expected to explain and account for matters of this nature, one cannot help but feel that the chroniclers were unable to encompass and understand what had actually taken place.

The author of *Silsilat an-nasab*, for example, all of a sudden begins to write "briefly and by way of summary" (*bar sabil-i iğāz va iḥtiṣār*)¹. Earlier historians note the change and make the necessary accommodations: most of them begin making reference to Ğunaid and Haidar by using the title *sultān* as opposed to the usual term *šaih* given to the heads of the Ardabil Order from Šaih Ṣafi ad-Din to Šaih Ibrāhim. In certain cases too, when writing about the Ṣafawid dynasty a specific "beginning" (*ibtidā'*) is made with Ğunaid who is said to have combined in his person both the religious and secular powers².

But no one among these writers goes beyond this hint of a change – no one that is except Faḍl Allāh ibn Rūzbihān Ḥunġī, the staunch Sunni writer at the court of Sultān Ya'qūb son of Uzūn Ḥasan Aq-qoyunlu, who observes: "... what a pity that, while Ṣafi al-Din preserved his being from a doubtful repast, he did not restrain his children from the vanities of this world. As a result, his progeny foresook poverty and humility for the throne of a kingdom." And he adds: "When the boon of succession reached Junayd, he altered the way of life of his ancestors:

¹ Zāhidī, *Silsilat*, 66. Cf. the treatment of Ğunaid and Haidar by Ḥwāndamīr, *Habib*, IV, 424–27; Qazwīnī, *Lubb*, 238–39; Gaffārī, *Gahān-drā*, 261–62; Mağdī, *Zīnat al-mağālis*, 977–78; and Iskandar Muṇṣī, *Tārīħ-i 'Alām-drā-yi 'Abbāsī*, I, 17–18.

² Qazwīnī, *Lubb*, 238, says: - وَمَا ابْدَاهَ إِنْ طَائِفَةً قَدِيمَةً دَرَ زَمَانَ حُضُورٍ سُلَطَانٍ جَنِيدَ بَوْهِيَ - and refers to Haidar by saying (p. 239): حُضُورٌ أَبُو النَّازِرِ سُلَطَانٌ حِيدَرٌ Mağdī in *Zīnat al-mağālis* says (p. 977):

«چون نوبت ارشاد بحضورت سلطان جنید... رسید آنحضرت داعیه سلطنت صوری فرموده»

Iskandar Muṇṣī in *Tārīħ-i 'Alām-drā-yi 'Abbāsī*, I, 19, speaks about Haidar in the following terms: «... تا آنکه جامه سلطنت صوری و معنوی گشته باطنی بدستور مشایخ راهل الله مالک طریق ارشاد و دین پروری و ظاهرآ بائین سلطنه مستند آرای سروری بود...»

Gaffārī, *Gahān-drā* (who uses the term "Sultān" for Ṣadr ad-Din, Ḥwāga 'All, and Ibrāhim, pp. 260–61) begins his section on Ğunaid (p. 261) as follows:

«... چون آثار سلطنت صوری همچون انوار ولایت معنوی واضح بود...»

and Ḥwāndamīr in *Habib as-siyar*, IV, 427, describes Haidar as follows:

«... و با آنکه جامع اسباب سیادت سوری (صوری/*sic*) و معنوی سلطان حیدر الصفری ...»

Nahrawālī in *Kitāb al-I'lām*, 223–24 describes the rise of Haidar as follows:

«وكان الشيخ حيدر بن الشيخ جنيد الصوفى له ظهور عجيب واستيلاه على ملوك العجم بعد من الأعمايب... وشرح ذلك بمجاج الى تاريخ مستقل ولا أعلم أحدا تعرّض له من العلماء الأعياد...»

Qaramānī in *Aḥbār ad-duwal* (who bases his account chiefly on Muṇaggim-bašī's *Gāmi'* *ad-duwal*) states, p. 344:

«وأول من قام من هذه الطائفة وجمع المسرور (الشيخ جنيد) بن الشيخ ابراهيم بن خواجه عل بن الشيخ صدر الدين بن الشيخ مسن الدين بن جبرائيل...»

and entitles his section on the Ṣafawids:

«الباب الثاني والخمسون: في ذكر ملوك العجم من آل حيدر الصوفى الأردبيل الاسماعيل»

the bird of anxiety laid an egg of longing for power in the nest of his imagination. Every moment he strove to conquer a land or a region."¹

From Ḥunḡī's account two aspects of this change can be clearly singled out: one dealing with a change of religious position, and the other pointing to a tactical change in the manner the leaders of the Order planned to achieve their ends.

Regarding the first of these two aspects Ḥunḡī states that the followers of the Order "openly called Shaykh Junayd God (*ilāh*), and his son Son of God (*ibn Allāh*) . . . In his praise they said: 'he is the Living One, there is no God but he'. Their folly and ignorance were such that, if someone spoke of Shaykh Junayd as dead, he was no more to enjoy the sweet beverage of life; and if someone said that a part of his body (head) became missing, they would give up the threshing ground of his existence to the wind of non-existence"². And when Ḥaidar assumed the leadership of the movement after his father's death, "His father's lieutenants (*khulafā*) came from every direction and foolishly announced the glad tidings of his divinity (*ulūhiyat*) . . . Many people from Rūm, Tālīsh, and Siyāh-kūh (Qarāja-dāgh) gathered to him, and it is reported that they considered him as their god (*ma'būd*) and, neglecting the duties of *namāz* and public prayers ('ibādāt), looked upon the shaykh as their *qibla* and the being to whom prostration was due (*masjūd*)."³

This claim to divine essence reached its culmination with Ḥaidar's son Ismā'il. In his poetry Ismā'il is proud of his descent from 'Ali and Fāṭima. He believes in the reincarnation of the divine substance of 'Ali. He himself used to abide with God, but now he had appeared in the world. Both the prophetic and *imāmite* gifts are combined in his person . . . He has come as God's light, as the Seal of the Prophets, as a Perfect Guide, as the guiding *imām* . . . The Ḥallāğian formula (of) "anā 'l-Haqq" lives in his soul⁴.

There were no prior indications that such a change was fast overtaking the Ardabil Order and its leaders. From contemplative *sūfism* under Šaiḥ Ṣafi ad-Dīn to open heresy of the *gulāt* type under Ĝunaid and Ḥaidar is a long way and a far cry. The only explanation that could be offered (and this only by looking at the consequences rather than at the causes) is that by assuming this super-human and divine role, the new-type leaders of the Order could rally their followers and lead them to *gazā* and conquest. That too is probably why the contemporary Muḥammad Ibn Falāḥ the Muša'ša' claimed to be the Mahdi. In other words, the religious change was simply a pretext for political ends. The two are inextricably united in the persons of Ĝunaid and Ḥaidar, and Šāh Ismā'il merely carried this to its natural conclusion. This is not to rob these leaders of their individuality and resourcefulness. But since we cannot possibly psychoanalyse them (if poetry were not an art form, then perhaps this could be done to Šāh Ismā'il – Ĝunaid and Ḥaidar did not leave any written statements) we must be satisfied with trying to understand their achievements.

Regarding the second aspect which, as we said, could be singled out from Ḥunḡī's treatment of Ĝunaid and Ḥaidar, and which we shall refer to simply as *gazā*, the convenient location of Ardabil on the frontiers of Dār al-Islām has already been noted in an earlier section⁵. On one or two occasions during the early history of the Order *gazā* activity in Āḍarbajāğan against the Christians of Georgia has also been observed⁶. However, in those early years of the life of the Order, *gazā* (if it existed at all in its historical sense) was occasional and perfunctory,

¹ Ḥunḡī/MINORSKY, *Tāriḥ-i 'Alam-ārā Amīni*, 63.

² *Ibid.*, 66.

³ *Ibid.*

⁴ MINORSKY, "The Poetry of Shāh Ismā'il I", *BSOAS*, X (1940–43), pp. 1006a–1053a.

⁵ See above p. 45 ff.

⁶ See above pp. 52, 54.

without interest or zeal. The leaders of the Şüfi Order at Ardabil were pious men leading a life of introspection and contemplation. But with Ǧunaid and Ḥaidar, *gazā* became a "state" policy and the constant occupation of the Order, its leaders and their followers.

It should be noted here that the entire area between Ādarbaiğān and Georgia across the Caucasus ranges was also the scene of large-scale military activity in the form of campaigns conducted by the conquerors – Mongols, Timūrids, etc. – and by locally established rulers throughout the thirteenth-fifteenth centuries. Uzūn Ḥasan, the leading figure among the Aq-qoyunu Turkmāns, conducted no less than five such campaigns against Georgia¹, and his son Sultān Ya'qūb invaded the area on more than one occasion. But these "organized" campaigns should be differentiated from the essentially "unorganized" activity of the *gāzī* warriors under Ǧunaid and Ḥaidar.

For all of a sudden now, the *murids* of the Order became the *guzāt-i şūfiya*², and under the leadership of Ǧunaid and Ḥaidar we see them fighting in large numbers against the Christian enclave of Trapezund, or against the Georgians of the Caucasus. It is no more the heart of the Muslim world which attracts them; it is no more Rūm, Śām, or Māwarā'annahr; it is no more the *Dār al-Islām* but the *Dār al-Harb*. Overnight they have become *gāzis* fighting the unbelievers along the Muslim frontiers of the north.

Before concentrating his efforts against the Caucasus region, Šaiḥ Ǧunaid tried his *gāzī* activity against the Byzantine enclave of Trapezund. Byzantine sources as well as Turkish sources testify to large-scale *gazā* in 861/1456 during the last years of Kalo Joannes. After winning initial victories against one of Joannes' leading men, Ǧunaid encamped before the walls of the city, which however remained impregnable³.

There are indications that Ǧunaid made extensive preparations before launching his *gāzī* career. When he assumed the leadership of the Order after his father's death in 851/1447, he journeyed in various parts of Syria and Anatolia. Ḥunḡi states that Ǧunaid undertook this trip "for some reason or other"⁴ but the hint appears to be that he was gathering his men or else giving them instructions as to what he wanted them to do.

In any case, the short-lived *gazā* conducted by Ǧunaid against Trapezund came to a sudden stop when Mehmed II, as he was rounding off the Ottoman boundaries in the east, ultimately conquered the city in 866/1461. Šaiḥ Ǧunaid had already directed his attention somewhere else, and later Ṣafawid *gāzī* activity was channeled against the area of the Caucasus. For in 864/1459–60, Ǧunaid was already engaged in large-scale operations against the Georgian Cherkes⁵. A year before, Uzūn Ḥasan had given his own sister in marriage to Ǧunaid, and the Ṣafawid leaders thus became "princes of the land". The contemporary Ḥunḡi remarks at this point: "Junayd's marriage became known even in the farthest corners of Rūm and Syria and, in view of this honour, the *Khalifas* of the earlier shaykhs wanted to wait on him."⁶

It has been pointed out by a modern Persian scholar that Šaiḥ Ǧunaid, according to the chronicles, combined the formal sultanate (*saltanat-i suwari*) with the spiritual sultanate

¹ BROWNE, *LHP*, III, 409 ff.

² Iskandar Muṇṣī, *Tārīḥ-i 'Alam-ārā-yi 'Abbāsī*, I, 18.

³ W. MILLER, *Trebizond*, 83 ff., based on Chalcocondyles (d. 1464). On Ǧunaid in Anatolia see 'Āşıq-pāşa Zāde (803–889/1400–1484), *Tawārīḥ-i Āl-i Osmān*, 264 ff.

⁴ Ḥunḡi/MINORSKY, 63, and n. 2 on the same page.

⁵ On the term "Cherkes" and its general connotation for this period see Ḥunḡi/MINORSKY, 64, n. 2, and Annex III, 117–119.

⁶ Ḥunḡi/MINORSKY, 64. On the "Halifas" see the chapter entitled "The Supporters of the Lords of Ardabil" in MINORSKY, *T. M.*, 189 ff., and FALSAFI, *Zandigāni-yi Sāh 'Abbās-i Awwal*, I, 161 ff. (on the Turkmān tribes), and 159–178 (on the Qızılbaş).

(*salṭanat-i ma'navi*); and on this basis he urged the *şūfīs*, his followers, to carry on *gazā* and *ğihād* against the unbelievers (*kuffār*), and called himself Sultān Günaid. Shortly afterwards, with ten thousand *şūfīs* he crossed the Aras River on a *gihād* against the Cherkes¹.

However, Günaid's success was limited, and he finally had to fight a battle with Sultān Halil, the Širwān-şāh, through whose territory he had to pass. The Ṣafawid *gāzīs* were defeated and Günaid died fighting at the foot of the Caucasian range².

About Śaih Haidar and his role in the *gāzī* activity of this period, the sources are slightly more informative. Ḥwāndamīr, for example, states that Sultān Haidar had the inclination (*mayałān*) for the attainment of the virtue of *gazā* and *ğihād* (*ihrāz-i fadīlat-i gazā wa-ğihād*)³. And Iskandar Muṇšī says that gaining the rewards of *gazā* prevailed over Haidar's nature (*ihrāz-i maṭubāt-i gazā bar fabi'at gālib būd*)⁴.

The more informed Faḍl Allāh ibn Rūzbihān Ḫungi left a more detailed picture of Haidar and his *gāzī* activity. He tells us that ". . . instead of lessons on the stages of a mystic (*maqāmāt-i ma'navi*), he read the pleasant stories of yore (*muṣayyibāt-i Pahlavī*)."⁵ Ḫungi left detailed descriptions of the large-scale preparations that were going on at Ardabil at this time. He appears to have picked up the information from eyewitnesses. ("When the royal train [of Sultān Ya'qūb Aq-qoyunlu] reached Ardabil, the author heard from trustworthy persons stories of the miserable ways of Haydar")⁶. "I have heard", Ḫungi continues, "that he (Haidar) made several thousand pikes, coats of mail, swords and shields . . . because he wished to teach his adepts (*murīds*) as their leader (*murshid*)"; and when preparations were ready, "he issued to them arms from his arsenal, and they were obedient to him – youths, robust and warlike, sword-slashers in clever fighting."⁷

Haidar had to clear his expeditions with the central authority – in this case, Sultān Ya'qūb Aq-qoyunlu son of Uzūn Ḥasan. His men, he wrote to the Sultān from Ardabil, "having exerted themselves (*iğtihād*) in various religious exercises and duly completed the great *ğihād*, which is the assault of one's own soul, they now . . . claimed the right to distinguish themselves in the lesser *ğihād*", which is to fight the infidels. "Should the sovereign permit, they would begin the holy war against the Cherkes . . ."⁸ Letters were dispatched to the Širwān-şāh (Farruh-yaśār), son of Sultān Halil, to give Haidar and his men safe conduct in their march to the north⁹.

This clearance was obtained in every one of Haidar's three expeditions (for the third one he sent his mother all the way to Qum to obtain the permission¹⁰). After the permission was obtained, we are told that "the Shaykh with devilish haste, and together with the detachment

¹ FALSAFI, op. cit., I, 180 (based on Ḥwāndamīr, *Habib*, IV, 425–426). Ḫungi (p. 64), however, says disparagingly "with a small number of heterogeneous elements".

² Ḫungi/MINORSKY, 64–65. Zāhidī, *Silsilat*, 67.

³/⁴ Ḥwāndamīr, *Habib*, IV, 432; and Iskandar Muṇšī, *Tārīħ*, I, 19. Both Ḥwāndamīr and Muṇšī are using a work on Haidar, which Ḥwāndamīr calls "*Futuħat-i Śāhi*" (IV, 434. The *Futuħat-i Śāmi* in the index to this volume, p. 758 is a printing error), and Muṇšī calls "*Futuħat-i Yumni/Yamani?*" (I, 18). Ḥwāndamīr (IV, 326–27) ascribes the work to Amīr Ṣadr ad-Dīn Sultān Ibrāhīm al-Aminī who completed it in 926/1519–20. The author is perhaps Śī'i and has translated 'Ali's *dīwān* into Persian *ruba'*s. (The author could not further be identified.)

⁵ Ḫungi/MINORSKY, 66.

⁶ Ibid., 67.

⁷ Ibid., 68.

⁸ Ibid.

⁹ Ibid., 69.

¹⁰ Ibid., 71.

that was in readiness, set forth from Ardabil to Sharvān . . . and innumerable troops joined him."¹

These expeditions were not taken seriously at first by the central authority. Sultān Ya'qūb is said to have remarked at one time: "What can happen from the campaigning of a *shaykh*, and what can a *dervish* do?"²

These raids, however, were quite large. "With some 10,000 men, the Shaykh passed through Darband on his way to the country of the infidel Cherkes . . . Having wrought havoc and taken captives, he triumphantly returned to Ardabil . . . The kings of the outlying regions were astonished at his success . . ." (first expedition). "The Shaykh returned from his (second) raid on the Cherkes and brought with him some 6,000 captives . . ."³ These figures should perhaps not be taken as definite historical data, but they do give an idea of the extent of this *gāzī* activity under Haidar.

This extensive *gāzī* activity of the Ṣafawids along the frontiers of the Caucasus brings to mind the history of the rise of the Ottoman empire in western Anatolia more than two centuries earlier. Professor P. WITTEK's examination of Ottoman medieval history led him to the conclusion that the rise of the state of Osmān should be sought in its *gāzī* origins. Bands of warriors of the faith were fighting the unbelievers along the frontiers of Islam and carving out states for themselves and their followers. Byzantium crumbled and the Ottoman empire slowly rose. WITTEK's findings have not yet been seriously questioned⁴.

Compared to the Ottomans, the Ṣafawid followers of Ĝunaid and Haidar were working against much greater odds:

A. To begin with, their field of operation lacked an established and permanent base located right on the frontier marchlands. For Ardabil was far away, and the Ṣafawid leaders had to guide their men and carry whatever equipment they had across long stretches of land until they could come face to face with the "enemy" and begin their *gazā*. Ardabil was several hundred miles to the southeast from where the *gāzīs* fought. Further it should be remembered that the nature of the terrain was extremely hostile in the sense that this is a mountainous area – the confluence of the Zagros and Elburz ranges meeting in the Armenian knot. This was not the relatively open country which the Ottoman *gāzīs* had at their disposal in their westward drive against Byzantium.

B. Secondly, the Ṣafawid *gāzīs* did not have freedom of action. On the one hand, they had to contend with a central authority that was still strong, namely the Aq-qoyunlu Turkmāns under Sultān Ya'qūb; and on the other, which was perhaps more serious, the Širwān-šāhs who controlled the territory immediately bordering on Georgian lands. And while the Ṣafawids, as has been pointed out, could neutralize one of these two fronts, the Aq-qoyunlu, to whom they were related through strong marriage ties, they could at no time placate the suspicion of the rulers of Širwān. The latter were always wary of this *gāzī* activity. Their country, as Ibn Rüzbihān Ḥunḡi tells us, was "a perpetual abode of peace."⁵ They gave permission to the *gāzīs* to pass through to the north only after specific instructions were issued by and received from the central authority of the Aq-qoyunlus in Tabriz. The Širwān-šāhs actually had every reason to be afraid, for on both occasions (i. e. during Ĝunaid and Haidar) the *gāzīs* turned against Širwān and were making preparations for its conquest. In the first case, the amirs of Širwān took care of the exigency on their own and were able to defeat Ĝunaid and have him killed. In the second case, the Širwān-šāh Farruh-yasār had to ask the

¹ *Ibid.*

² *Ibid.*, 70.

³ *Ibid.*, 69–70.

⁴ P. WITTEK, *The Rise of the Ottoman Empire*, London 1938.

⁵ Ḥunḡi/MINORSKY, 72.

assistance of Sultân Ya'qûb since he (the ruler of Širwân) was forced to evacuate his capital city of Šamâhi in order to escape the ruthless onslaught of the Şafawid *gâzîs*. Ya'qûb himself, of course, finally realized that the free hand he had originally given to Haidar was over-reaching itself, and so he had to act to stop it and ultimately save his own crown. He therefore marched toward the north, sending one of his generals ahead with a large contingent of imperial troops. Haidar had to fight on both fronts; and as "the şûfîs . . . formed a circle around him and tried to repel and impede (the attackers)"¹ he died as a martyr on the slopes of Mt. Elburz.

It was natural for the *gâzîs* to turn against Širwân, because only by removing this impediment could they have the whole field free to themselves. And this was the first step taken by Sâh Ismâ'il twelve years later. But by that time the central government of the Aq-qoyunlu was torn to pieces by interminable succession problems, and Ismâ'il did not fear action from that side. Furthermore, he could claim that he was only trying to take revenge from the rulers of Širwân for the death of his father and grandfather – both a good Muslim pretext and a convenient expedient.

C. A third difference between the Ottoman and Şafawid experiments was the fact that while Osmân, Orhân and the others were only the leaders of the *gâzî* warriors in the battle-fields, Ğunaïd and Haidar were both military commanders and religious heads of the Şüfî Order at Ardabil. This dual capacity concentrated too much power in the hands of the Şafawid leaders, and, tending to the religious needs of their followers no doubt detracted from the efficient execution of the *gazâ* itself. And so it may be argued that assuming divine powers in order to rally their followers behind them (as has been hinted at above), Ğunaïd and Haidar may actually have been hindered rather than helped in the execution of their *gâzî* operations.

Two points (at least) remain to be explained: one, why is it that this *gâzî* activity took place at this time? And secondly, how did it assist in the establishment of the new state?

A tentative answer to the first question is perhaps to blame it all on the Turks! Mehmed II, as was mentioned above, had just rounded off the eastern boundaries of his empire. The centralizing might of the Ottomans was too much to be accepted by the "freedom-loving" Turkmâns (who, it must not be forgotten, were the devoted followers of the Order at Ardabil). These Turkmâns flocked to the east, and Ğunaïd and Haidar simply gathered them together and led them against the infidel Georgians. *Gazâ* was always an attractive pastime!

If this is true, then we have the interesting and rather curious situation where the Anatolian "Turks" who under Osmân and Orhân were conducting *gazâ* in the west against Byzantium are now the "Turkmâns" who were engaging in similar *gâzî* activity under Ğunaïd and Haidar against the Georgians. But who were the Turks? And who the Turkmâns? Are we to assume that they are all accounted for so neatly by Z. V. TOGAN's "two million" who were pushed westward by the invading Mongols two or three centuries earlier²?

The second question as to how this *gâzî* activity helped in the ultimate foundation of the Şafawid state need not pose such difficult problems. The Turkmân *gâzîs* of Ğunaïd and Haidar received their "basic training", so to speak, during the two or three decades before Ismâ'il; so that when his *furûğ* occurred around 1500 they were the seasoned fighters of previous campaigns. The consummation of the act needed only good scouts to lead the way to the north. In true *gâzî* fashion, Ismâ'il conquered Baku before turning to Tabriz.

In addition to the religious *gûlât* factor and the political *gâzî* factor there were other factors that operated to help the leaders of the Ardabil Order attain their inevitable victory. Some of these have already been mentioned in passing.

¹ *Ibid.*, 81.

² See above p. 59, note 1.

The close ties between the Şafawid *düdmān* and the Aq-qoyunlu royal house through the marriages arranged by Uzūn Ḥasan between his sister and Śaiḥ Ǧunaid and his daughter and Śaiḥ Haidar gave the Şafawid leaders a much higher position than ever before. Their descent from Śaiḥ Ṣafi ad-Dīn – in itself a great honor – became now more meaningful through their relation to the ruling family. This is another aspect of the spiritual-temporal duality which Ǧunaid and Haidar enjoyed. True, Uzūn Ḥasan espoused the cause of the Şafawid Order more in opposition to the Qara-qoyunlu Ğahān-šāh than to any belief in the Şafawid cause itself. Due to the growing power of Ǧunaid at Ardabil Ğahān-šāh was "afraid to lose his own throne"¹, and asked him to leave the city, whereby the Şafawid leader proceeded west towards Diyar-Bakr and Uzūn Ḥasan welcomed him. Later after defeating Ğahān-šāh, Uzūn Ḥasan re-instated Ǧunaid in the seat of his ancestors.

Thus Uzūn Ḥasan, the better diplomat, reached an accommodation with the Şüfî Order although his orthodox Sunni beliefs would certainly have disapproved of the new leaders' extreme religious views². His son Sultân Ya'qûb kept the good relations with the Şafawids for as long as he possibly could, and it was only when the situation became quite untenable and the Şafawid leaders turned against Śirwân that he intervened to stop them.

Following the death of Ǧunaid and Haidar the Şafawid movement remained alive mainly through the intrinsic strength of the Order. The influential heads of the Turkmān tribes kept a watchful eye over Haidar's three sons, 'Ali, Ismâ'il and Ibrâhim who were now banished to distant İştâhr in Fârs and kept there under custody. But the deteriorating political situation in İrân, Iraq, and Anatolia lent itself to the growth of the movement during the last decade of the fifteenth century. It was a period of weakening or merely "peaceful" regimes of rulers who were engaged in internecine succession strife, or who seemed either not too ambitious for new conquests or simply complacent with a feeling of their own adequacy at their opulent courts.

In the west, Mehmed II passed away in 886/1481, and for thirty years after him, i. e., during the reign of Sultân Bâyezid II, there were almost no conquests made by the Ottomans³. In fact, Bâyezid's reign was so "peaceful" that movements of a strongly religious-şî'i character almost did away with the allegiance of Anatolia to the Ottoman dynasty⁴. Further, the internal situation in Turkey was exacerbated by the attempts of the Sultân's brother Prince Djem to capture the leadership. "As long as Djem was alive (he died in Europe under suspicious circumstances in 901/1495), Bâyezid could not take the risk of committing his forces irretrievably to a major enterprise either in the East or in the West."⁵ It is no surprise therefore that when a new conquering Sultân ascended the throne at Istanbul in the person of Selim I (1512–1520) the newly established Şafawid order in Tabriz suffered its first major defeat and was in real danger of extinction.

¹ Hwândamîr, *Habîb*, IV, 425; and Iskandar Muñî, *Târih*, I, 17.

² However, see the curious story in D. Ross, "The Anonymous history of Shâh Ismâ'il", p. 253 ff., where the author of this chronicle tells of Śaiḥ Haidar's dream in which he saw Haqrat-i 'All who directed him to make the *tâq-i Haidari*. When Uzūn Ḥasan heard of this he ordered a cap for himself, "kissed it and placed it on his own head . . . (and) bade each of his children to do likewise". In an *Ard-nâma* describing the review of the forces during the governorate of Sultân Ḥâllı son of Uzūn Ḥasan (who lost to his brother Ya'qûb), Dawwâni who was an eyewitness describes the march in front of the Sultân of "the Sayyids 'ulamâ, and imâms with banners and drums of the sacred Imâm-zâda Sayyid Ahmed b. Imâm Mûsâ al-Ridâ (sic) . . ." See MINORSKY, "A Civil and Military Review in Fârs, in 881/1476", *BSOAS*, X (1940–43) 153–154.

³ On the "feeble and inglorious reign" of Bâyezid II see the Preface to S. N. FISHER, *The Foreign Relations of Turkey, 1481–1512*, p. 5.

⁴ This culminated in the revolt in Tekke under Śâh Qull in 917/1511 during the last year of Bâyezid's reign. See FISHER, *op. cit.*, 90–102.

⁵ V. J. PARRY, "Bâyezid II", *EI*, new edition.

In the east, i. e., in the territories under Timūrid domination, the situation was much more chaotic and signs of weakness and complete disintegration were everywhere much in evidence. Sultān Abū Sa'id, the last effective Timūrid ruler in Māwarā'annahr, was defeated by Uzūn Ḥasan Aq-qoyunlu and died in 873/1468-69 leaving no united authority that could wield concerted strength either of defense or of exertion of power over the lost provinces in western Irān. His direct descendants ruled here and there¹, and were busy fighting among each other and against two new powers that were fast rising in the area: Bābur on the one hand, and the Uzbeks on the other². One notable exception to this Timūrid mêlée was the illustrious court of Sultān Ḥusain Baiqarā at Herāt (872-911/1468-1506).

In "Irān" proper – if it is permissible to use such a term at this juncture – the state of the ruling Turkmān dynasty was so hopelessly weak as to be considered the immediate factor leading to the rise of effective Ṣafawid control under Šāh Ismā'il. Uzūn Ḥasan, the only possible contender for a united and integrated Irān, died in 882/1478 shortly after receiving a signal defeat at the hands of Mehmed II of Turkey³. The only strong successor after him was his son Sultān Ya'qūb who had an effective reign from 883/1478 to 896/1491. We have already seen how the timely intercession of this Sultān on the side of the Širwān-šāh put an end (though temporary) to Ṣafawid gāzī activity. It would be idle to argue that continued centralized strength on the part of the Aq-qoyunlu could have made the entire Ṣafawid movement rather impossible. Such speculation is indeed indefensible in view of the "doctrinal" strength of the Ṣafawid movement. However, instead of centralized authority we witness the greatest possible weakness among the Aq-qoyunlu during this period, i. e. from the death of Ya'qūb to the defeat of Alwand by Šāh Ismā'il at Šurūr in 907/1501, the date which marks the *hurūf* of Šāh Ismā'il. This weakness, however, is so closely tied up with the affairs of the Ṣafawids during the period between Haidar and Ismā'il that it will be best to discuss it with direct reference to them.

The Ṣafawid *dūdmān* and the followers of the family remained an important factor in Aq-qoyunlu politics during the decade or more between Haidar and Ismā'il. Sultān 'Ali Pādišāh, Ismā'il's elder brother and head of the Order after Haidar's death, helped (after the release of the three "princes" from their confinement at Iṣṭāḥr) to settle a family succession struggle between two Aq-qoyunlu contenders. (Another such struggle by two other contenders was solved by partitioning the Aq-qoyunlu possessions between the two contenders when a certain *darwīsh* warned that "there would shortly come out of Gilān a person who would... establish the faith of the Twelve Imāms, and restore law and order in the land of Irān.")⁴ But he lost his life immediately afterwards fighting the men of the same Aq-qoyunlu contender whom he had helped. When his end was near, Sultān 'Ali "abdicated"⁵ in favor of his younger brother Ismā'il but not before making the prophecy: "Oh my brother!... The die of heaven has been

¹ For a quick look at Timūrid princes and their areas of rule see chart opposite p. 268 in LANE-POOLE, *Mohammadan Dynasties*.

² On this period (which lies outside the terms of reference of this chapter) see J. B. HARRISON, P. HARDY, and M. Fuad KÖPRÜLÜ, "Bābur" in *EI*, new edition.

³ In 878/1474. "This battle upset the cup of Uzūn Ḥasan's fortune, and for twenty or thirty years assured the safety of the Sultān's eastern frontier." BROWNE, *LHP*, III, 412-13, quoting from 'Abd ar-Rahmān Sheref Bey, *Tā'rīkh-i Devlet-i 'Alīyya*, p. 173.

⁴ Ross, *Anonymous*, 306.

⁵ It is not clear how "succession" was carried out among members of the Ṣafawid *dūdmān*. Ḫwāndamīr, *Habib*, IV, 441, is graphic in his description:

وَتَاجَ وَدْسَارَ خُوَيْشَ رَا بَرْ فَرْقَ مَبَارِكَ آخْضُورَتْ (يعنِ شَاهَ اسْعَمِيلَ) نَادَهُ.

Hasan-i Fasā'l in *Fārsnāma-yi Nāṣīrī*, pt. 1, p. 87, in describing the succession from Saīh Ṣafī ad-Dīn to Ḫwāgā 'Alī uses the expression "*bar hasb-i nāṣṣ-i waṣīyat*", and when he speaks about the succession of Saīh Ibrāhīm (pp. 87-88), he says "*bi-hukm-i waṣīyat-o-williyat-i 'ahd*". In the case of Ḫwāndamīr the whole

cast in your name, and before long you will come out of Gilân like a burning sun, and with your sword sweep infidelity from the face of the earth."¹

The political situation continued to deteriorate, and "when the Aq-qoyunlu state became weak", Qazwîni states in *Lubb al-tawârîh*, "confusion reigned in the Iranian lands . . . and plunder and raids became prevalent, and the affairs of the world lost order and organization."² The chiefs among the Turkmân followers of the Order sensing this utterly disrupted state of affairs, "smuggled" the two remaining brothers, Ismâ'il and Ibrâhim, to safety in Gilân³.

In Gilân, the two Şafawid princes, Ismâ'il and Ibrâhim, were well-received. (After a few months Ibrâhim either defected or went back to Ardabil as a hostage)⁴. The region (including Lâhiğân) was *śī'i*⁵ and the relations between its rulers and the Aq-qoyunlu were not exactly friendly⁶. In any case, the Şüfi leaders took no chances, and Ismâ'il was very carefully guarded⁷. The cause of the movement prospered very much along the southern shores of the Caspian so that when Ismâ'il left Gilân he had followers from all over the area⁸.

While in Gilân Ismâ'il was tutored by Maulânâ Şams ad-Dîn Lâhiğî with whom he read the Qur'ân and Persian and Arabic works⁹. There is no indication in the sources that Ismâ'il studied any *śī'i* sciences with Lâhiğî¹⁰.

thing could be simply stylistic; in Fasâ'l's case the author appears to be using *śī'i* (*iħnâ'ašârî*) terminology. But the problem requires further investigation.

¹ Ross, *Anonymous*, 262. 'Alî's death is here given as occurring in A. H. 900. *Habib as-siyar* gives A. H. 898.

² Qazwîni, *Lubb al-tawârîh*, 240.

³ For the names of some of the Turkmân chiefs see Rûmlû, *Aħsan al-tawârîh*, I, 6, and Iskandar Muñî, *Târîh*, I, 24. Hwândamîr in *Habib*, IV, 441, refers to them as "*umârâ-yi śâfiyyâ*".

⁴ Hwândamîr, *Habib*, IV, 442:

"وَبِسْ ازْ چند ماه سید ابراهیم خیال مراجعت فرموده تاج دروازه ترک خیدری را که شمار دودمان امامت و سروریست از سر برداشت و بستر تراکه آن قوینلو طاقیه بر تارک مبارک نهاده علم توجه بصوب اردبیل برآفرانش".

⁵ Samarqandî, *Mâfi'a as-sâ'dain*, p 1356 ff. He devotes a special section on Gilân and Lâhiğân. Cf. Gannâbi, *Tuhfat al-adâb* (selections in B. DORN, IV, 468 ff.), and Sûstari, *Mağâlis*, 42 and 398.

⁶ Qazwîni, *Lubb*, 225–26, and Ross, *Anonymous*, 280 and 295.

⁷ Rûmlû, *Aħsan*, I, 29, tells that at one time when Ismâ'il was in Tâliş, the chief of Tâliş was suspected of complicity with Farrûh-yaśâr the Sirwân-Sâh. So when he came to call on Ismâ'il the Turkmân chiefs were prepared to meet any eventuality.

⁸ Gaffârî, *Gâhân-îrâ*, 264; and MINORSKY, *A History of Sharwân and Darband*, 132 (based on Muṇâggîm-bâbî, *Gâmi' ad-duwal*).

⁹ Rûmlû, *Aħsan*, I, 9; Ross, *Anonymous*, 271 and 288; Sâm Mîrzâ, *Tuhfa-yi Sâmi*, 51 (who calls him "Qâdî Şams al-Dîn mu'allim"); and Muñî, *Târîh*, I, 26. (It could not be conclusively proven at this stage that Maulânâ Şams ad-Dîn Lâhiğî who was Ismâ'il's tutor in Gilân is the same as Şams ad-Dîn Muhammâd ibn 'Alî al-Gilâni, al-Lâhiğî an-Nûrbâbî, the commentator on Sabistârî's *Gulşân-i râz*. On this Lâhiğî see: Sûstari, *Mağâlis*, 306–309; the long introduction (especially p. 82 ff.) by Kaiwân SAM'I of a recent edition of Lâhiğî's *Mağâlis al-i īğâz fi ūrâh Gulşân-i râz*, Tehran 1337/1959; and H. CORBIN, *Terre Celeste* . . . , 181).

¹⁰ See for example 'Alî ibn Şams ad-Dîn ibn Hâgi Husain, *Târîh-i Hâni* (880–920/1475–1514), edited B. DORN, II, 104:

"وَبَعْدَ ازْ چند وقت لوح صان ایشانزا (بنی شاه اسماعیل در گیلان) بتفوش علم و آداب فرض و سنت که شیخ ذائق آن دودمان بود زینت داد و بوطایف سنت حسنه حقوق پدری مرعی داشت . . ."

But Cf. Nahrawâlî, *Kitâb al-i lâm*, 233–34:

"وَكَانَ شَاهُ اسْمَاعِيلُ فِي لَاهِبَانِ . . . وَبَلَادِ لَاهِبَانِ فِيهَا كَثِيرٌ مِنَ الْفَرَقِ الْفَالَّةِ كَالرَّافِضَةِ وَالْحَرُورِيَّةِ وَالْبَيْذِيَّةِ وَغَيْرِهِمْ فَلَعِلَّهُمْ شَاهُ اسْمَاعِيلُ فِي صَفَرِهِ مُذَهِّبُ الرَّفِضِ فَإِنَّ آبَاءَهُ كَانُوا شَعَارِمُ مُذَهِّبِ الْسَّنَّةِ وَكَانُوا مُطَهِّرِيْنَ مُنَقَّادِيْنَ لِسَنَّةِ رَسُولِ اللَّهِ . . . وَلَمْ يَظْهُرْ الرَّفِضُ غَيْرُ شَاهِ اسْمَاعِيلِ . . ."

and Qaramâni, *Abâbâr ad-duwal*, 344:

". . . نَخْرَجَ عَنْ ذَلِكَ شَاهَ اسْمَاعِيلَ وَأَلَّا لَاهِبَانَ وَكَانَ بِهَا شَيْءًا مِنْ أَجْيَاهُ وَاللهُ هُنْيَجُو وَشَيْئُو وَمُلْنُو الرَّفِضُ وَوَهْلُو بِالنَّصَرِ . . ."

Ismā'il and his men apparently watched closely over the interneccine troubles between members of the Aq-qoyunlu dynasty. Perhaps spies carried reports about the situation; for only "When news about the confusion and civil strife in the state of the Sultāns of the Aq-qoyunlu Turkmāns came to the ears of the Sulaymān of the time (i. e. Šāh Ismā'il), he decided on the opinion to move out of Gilān."¹

Ismā'il's passage from Gilān to Arzingān in the heart of the Anatolian plateau was like a triumphal march. From Lāhiğān he camped first at Dailamān; then moved to Tārum. There he reviewed his forces². When danger seemed to be coming from a Bārāni chief one hundred men were appointed to guard him against any possible treachery³. Upon arrival at Ardabil he was warned that Alwand (one of the last chiefs of the Aq-qoyunlu dynasty) might seek him out; so he left secretly and came to Tāliš country in the east along the Caspian⁴.

In the spring,⁵ Ismā'il returned to Ardabil but was advised by the leading Sūfis among the Turkmān chiefs to "send orders by swift messengers to the Sūfis in Rūm and Sām, and then betake himself to the frontiers of Arzingān; . . . for there he would be near his supporters who, on hearing of his arrival, would the more speedily assemble."⁶

On his way more supporters flocked under his banner and he was joined "by a regiment of the sūfis of Rūm"⁷, so that by 906 A. H. (which began end of July 1500 A. D.) he arrived in Arzingān where seven thousand of the *murīds* and *sūfis* of the Ustağlū, Şāmlū, Rūmlū, Tekellū, Dū l-Qadr, Afşār, Qāğār, Warsāq, and the *sūfis* of Qarāğadāg had assembled⁸.

It is perhaps to this period that we should ascribe the undated correspondence between Šāh Ismā'il and the Ottoman Sultān Bāyezid II preserved in Feridūn's *Munšā'at*⁹. Ismā'il wanted to impress on Bāyezid that he was really in a territory whose inhabitants were loyal to the Ṣafawid cause. Bāyezid, however, was worried about the men who were "crossing over" to Ismā'il's side, and pointed out that the untenable situation was becoming a drain on the military economy of eastern Anatolia. He asked that Ismā'il should send back anyone who crossed over. Ismā'il apparently disregarded these instructions and entered deep into Ottoman territory seeking out his enemies and promising he would not molest the inhabitants. Bāyezid became conciliatory and showed a spirit of cooperation. In the meantime, he exchanged correspondence with a Kurdish border amīr in order to ascertain the strength of Šāh Ismā'il and his followers and to find out whatever happened to the "*daulat-i Bāyandariya*" (i. e. the Aq-qoyunlus)¹⁰. He also exchanged views with Qanṣūh al-Ğaurī, the Mamlūk Sultān of Egypt, on "the man who appeared in the eastern lands."¹¹

¹ Iskandar Munşī, *Tāriħ*, I, 26.

² Rūmlū, *Ahsan al-tawārīħ*, I, 26.

³ *Ibid.*, I, 31 ff.:

هیک از اولاد میرزا جهانشاه (فراتریلور) مرسوم بسلطان حسین باران . . .

This incident occurred in Gökçe Dengiz (گوچه دنگیز). See also GLASSEN, 176 ff.

⁴ Ross, *Anonymous*, 332-340.

⁵ Early in the year 1500. It is still A. H. 905.

⁶ Ross, *Anonymous*, 340. At this point of the text Denison Ross stops since *Habib as-siyar* and the Anonymous History of Šāh Ismā'il "begin to coincide very exactly".

⁷ Rūmlū, *Ahsan*, I, 35.

⁸ Qazwīnī, *Lubb*, 240-41; and Rūmlū, *Ahsan*, I, 41. (Munşī, *Tāriħ*, I, 27, gives the figure "three to four thousand").

⁹ Feridūn, *Munšā'at*, I, 345-47.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, I, 353-54.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, 355-56. At this point, mention of the Ṣafawid movement begins to appear in the contemporary Egyptian sources. See for example Ibn Iyās, *Badd'i' az-ruhār*, IV, 39, 118, 123, 191, and 205.

Meanwhile at Arzinğān, Shāh Ismā'il held a council of war and asked his Turkman chiefs what course of action to follow. The decision came most naturally: to attack Širwān¹. The element of revenge was there, and the *gāzī* aspect of fighting against the Cherkes north of Širwān would whet the appetite of the Sūfi rank and file. In this way too, Ismā'il would avoid an uncertain clash with the Ottomans and a direct involvement with whatever strength the Aq-qoyunlu Alwand might muster. So he set out against Farruh-yasār the Širwān-Shāh who had placed a 1,000-tuman reward on his head².

The conquest of Širwān followed. Then Shāh Ismā'il headed further north and conquered Baku. Turning against the Aq-qoyunlu Alwand, he defeated him at Šurür-Nahğawān. Then followed his *gulūs* in Tabriz.

¹ Ḥwāndamīr, *Habib as-siyar*, IV, 457:

«آن پادشاه عالیجاه چنانچه مذکور شد در ارزنجان از قبول آرای مختلفه امرا و سرداران گردن پیچیده وبالهای هائف فیضی و تلقین ملفن لا ریبی بروش شروان را اختیار فرموده»

Cf. Rūmī, *Ahsan*, I, 41-42, where the account of this war council is more elaborate

«چون خاقان اسکندر شان در ارزنجان نزول اجلال فرمود . . . بعثتی از ارکان دولت قاهره را طلب فرموده امر کرد که با سران سپاه مطارده نمایند که بکدام طرف توجیه می باید نمود»

and where Shāh Ismā'il is said to have consulted (استخاره) with the Twelve Imāms.

² Ross, *Anonymous*, 336; Rūmī, *Ahsan al-tawārīh*, I, 28.

GENERAL CONCLUSIONS

From Šaih Ṣafi ad-Din, the founder of the Ṣafawid Order at Ardabil, to Šāh Ismā'il, the founder of the Ṣafawid state in Irān, are more than two and a half centuries.

The political history of this period was marked by a confused state of affairs throughout Irān, Iraq, and Anatolia during the Mongol period, the post-Mongol Ilhānids, the successor states in Iraq and Irān, the *beylik* period in Anatolia, the Timūrid period, and finally the period of the Turkmān federations of the Qara-qoyunlu and the Aq-qoyunlu. The disorder, confusion, and weakness were slowly becoming more acute, so that by the time of the last Aq-qoyunlus, as the well-known Persian historian Yaḥyā Qazwīnī put it, "the affairs of the world lost order and organization."¹ The time was ripe for a change; and the change came with Šāh Ismā'il and the Ṣafawids.

The religious history of this period, on the other hand, was marked by an efflorescence of Šūfism and folk - Islamic ideas at the expense of traditional high Islam both in its Sunni synthesis and its *iṭnā'asārī* Si'i variety. Folk Islam naturally knew no limitations, and we have seen how a ſūfi order like that of Šaih Ṣafi ad-Din of Ardabil developed into an extreme ſi'i movement of the *gulāt* type and gradually became the dominant power in Āzarbaiğān and slowly assumed control of the rest of Irān. The line between Šūfism and Si'ism was always difficult to draw; and as M. Henri CORBIN put it, "True Si'ism is the same as Taṣawwuf, and similarly, genuine and real Taṣawwuf cannot be anything other than Si'ism."²

Both politically and religiously, however, the people of Irān, Iraq, and Anatolia appear to have lost most if not all of their "freedoms" by the end of the fifteenth century; and the rise of the Ṣafawid state was in essence a successful attempt at imposing a political and religious system which was quite alien to the indigenous population of this part of the Muslim world. This conformity was already in existence in the Egyptian and Syrian areas under Mamlūk domination; it was also becoming so in the lands of the Ottomans; and the Ṣafawids, in this context, constitute the third major unifying power in the Middle East at the end of the fifteenth century. The Uzbeks in Māwarā'annahr and the Moghuls in India can also be thought of in similar terms at this juncture in Islamic history.

However, it would be wrong to assume that the Šūfi Order of Ardabil, which was chosen as a case study for this period, was alone in undergoing the changes described earlier in this study. References have been made to the popular movement of the Sarbadārs in Ḥurāsān as well as to the *mahdi* rising of the Muša'šā's in the marshlands of southern Iraq. But the list is far from being complete:

¹ Yaḥyā Qazwīnī, *Lubb al-tawdīh*, p. 240. See also above p. 80.

² H. CORBIN, "Sih guftār dar bāb-i tārīh-i ma'nawiyat-i Irān", *Maqāla-yi Dāniškada-yi Adabiyāt*, Tehran, V (1337/1959), pp. 46-51, 52-57, and 58-63 (originally three radio talks translated from the French):

"تشیع واقعی همان تصور است، و بنحو متقابل تصور اصلی و راستین چیزی بجز تشیع نتوان بوده."

- a) Sāh Ni'mat Allāh Wali of Kirmān (731–834/1330–1431), and “the two *sayyids* of Bam” – Sams ad-Dīn Ibrāhīm and Tāhir ad-Dīn Muḥammad.
- b) Qāsim-i Anwār (757–837/1356–1433), to whom a passing reference was made in the course of this study, deserves a special investigation. His relations with the Ṣūfī Order at Ardabil, as well as his activities in Māwarā'annahr and his “collusion” with the Ḥurūfīs, have yet to be studied and explained.
- c) Muḥammad Nürbahāš (795–889/1392–1484) and the Nürbahāsiya order: its origins and later influence under the early Ṣafawids.
- d) Bahā' ad-Dīn Naqšband (718–791/1318–1388) and the Naqšbandīs who as a Sunnī order require a special treatment which should throw valuable light on the religious history of this period.
- e) The Ahl-i Ḥaqq and the role they played throughout the entire area during the fifteenth century.
- f) The Ḥurūfīs, founded by Faḍl Allāh of Astarābād (put to death in 796/1393–94), and their activities both in Māwarā'annahr and in Anatolia.
- g) The Ismā'īlīs and the fate that befell them following the Alamūt episode.
- h) The Futuwwa and its influence in the cities of Anatolia and elsewhere.
- i) The Bektāshīya, Bairamiya, and several other *fariqas* in Anatolia during the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries.
- j) The early years of Sultān Husain Baiqarā (whose reign began in Herāt in 873/1468), and the attempt to convert him to Šī'ism, and the influence of Čāmi and Mir 'Alī Šir Nawā'i in bringing him back to the Sunnī fold.
- k) And finally, the line of the great Sunnī thinkers and scholars of this period: 'Aḍud ad-Dīn al-Iġī (d. 756/1355), Sa'd ad-Dīn Taftazānī (d. 791/1389), as-Sayyid aš-Šarīf al-Ġurgānī (d. 816/1413), and Ġalāl ad-Dīn Dawwānī (d. 908/1502) – a study of whose works and times will no doubt reveal very valuable information regarding the development of Sunnism itself during this period.

These are only a few – perhaps the most important – of the movements and personalities that should be studied in order to understand more fully the religious developments in Irān, Iraq, and Anatolia (and to a certain extent in Māwarā'annahr) during the fifteenth century. For the Ṣūfī Order of Ardabil, and the later Ṣafawid movement in Ādharbaigān and Irān, are only one manifestation of the religious ferment that characterized the historical period between the coming of the Mongols and the rise of centralized government in Irān under Sāh Ismā'il.

In the case of the Ṣafawids, the ferment began as a simple Ṣūfī *fariqa* under Šaih Ṣafi ad-Dīn and his immediate successors, and grew into a militant and *gāzī* movement under his fifteenth century descendants Ĝunaid and Ḥaidar. This development also caused a change in the religious beliefs of the leaders of the Order and their devoted followers. From a humble beginning as the priestly heads of a contemplative Ṣūfī order, they announced their divinity as gods or sons of God – the supreme chiefs of a movement of warriors of the faith (*gāzīs*) fighting the Christian “unbelievers” along the frontiers of Dār al-Islām. Religion was subordinated to political expediency.

This is perhaps where the Ṣafawid movement was basically different from all the other religious manifestations during the fifteenth century. The others all seem to have remained entrenched in religiosity, or else were lost in the labyrinths of religious doctrines at the high Islamic level or even at the popular level of folk-Islam. In either case (as high Muslim or Ṣūfī *šaihs*) they continued to serve the people well – and that no doubt was what they were intended to do. The leadership remained submerged, or was simply elevated to that of holiness,

sainthood, or mere reverence. With the Ṣafawids, it went a step further, a crucial step: the leadership, as it developed under Ǧunaid and Ḥaidar and found its culmination with Šāh Ismā'īl, demanded more than reverence. It demanded and received "worship", godly worship. The Ṣūfi followers "openly called Shaykh Junayd God (*ilāh*), and his son Son of God (*ibn-Allāh*) . . . In his praise they said: 'he is the Living One, there is no God but he'."¹ And Šāh Ismā'īl "himself used to abide with God, but now he has appeared in the world."²

All this was subsequently toned down to what in Islam came nearest to "divinity", i. e. descent from the Twelve Imāms and through them from Ḥaḍrat-i 'Ali, the cousin and son-in-law of the Prophet. This was quite natural and should not have upset the great Dawwāni who, we are told, (with reference to the famous *ḥadīṭ* "He who dies without knowing the Imām of his time dies the death of an unbeliever"), one day asked his students: "Who is the Imām of the age?" When they replied that it was Šāh Ismā'īl, Dawwāni became furious!³ It will be difficult to find out who, in Dawwāni's opinion, the Imām of the age was in Irān at the beginning of the sixteenth century.

¹ See above, p. 73.

² See V. MINORSKY, "The Poetry of Shāh Ismā'īl", *BSOAS*, X (1940–43), p. 1006a–1053a.

³ Hwānsari, *Raudat al-ġannat*, p. 708.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

'Abd Allāh ibn Nūr ad-Dīn (d. 1173/1759): *Kitāb-i taqkira-yi Šūštar*, ed. Maulā BAYĀN and Hidāyat HUSAIN, Calcutta, 1343/1924.

'Abd al-Ğālī ibn 'Abī al-Faḍl al-Qazwīnī ar-Rāzī (ca. 560/1164): *Kitāb an-naqd, ma'rūf bi - Ba'd maqālib an-nawāṣib fī naqd ba'd faḍdīḥ ar-Rawḍafiq*, ed. Ğalāl ad-Dīn Husain URMAWI, ma'rūf bi-MUḤADDIT, Tehran, 1331/1371/1953.

Abrū, Ḥāfiẓ, Sīhāb ad-Dīn 'Abd Allāh ibn Luṭf Allāh ibn 'Abd ar-Rašīd al-Hywāfi (d. 834/1430-31): *Cinq opuscules de Ḥāfiẓ-i Abrū, concernant l'histoire de l'Iran au temps de Tamerlan*, ed. Felix TAUER, Prague 1959.

- , *Dail Čāmi' at-tawāriḥ-i Rašīdi*, ed. Ḥānbābā BAYĀN, Tehran, 1317.
- , "Tārīḥ-i Umarā-yi Sarbadāriya", in Felix TAUER, *Cinq opuscules de Ḥāfiẓ-i Abrū*.

Abrū/BAYĀN: *Chronique des Rois mongols en Iran*, transl. Ḥānbābā BAYĀN, Paris, 1936.

Abū l-Fidā, al-Malik al-Mu'ayyad Ismā'īl (d. 732/1331): *Kitāb al-Muḥtaṣar fī aḥbār al-baṣar*, Cairo 1325/1907, volume 4 (which begins with the year 663/1264). [Work continued by Ibn al-Wardī, d. 1349].

Abū l-Fidā/Ibn al-Wardī: *Kitāb al-Muḥtaṣar . . .*; see Abū al-Fidā.

Add 200, Cambridge University MS.: See Ross, D., "The Anonymous history of Shāh Ismā'īl".

AFŞĀR, İraq: *Fihrist-i maqālid-i Fārsi*, [English title-page: *Index Iranicus*], Tehran, 1340/1962 -

Āḡā BuzŪRG aṭ-ṬIHRĀNī, Muhammed Muḥsin, 1876-: *aṭ-Dārī'a illa taṣdīf aṭ-Śī'a*, Tehran, 1355/1936 -

al-Aharī, Abū Bakr al-Quṭbī: *Tārīkh-i Shaikh Uwais*, ed. and transl. (only pp. 134-184 of the original MS) by J. B. VAN LOON, The Hague, 1954.

al-Ahrī: See al-Aharī.

Alberi, Eugenio (1809-1878) ed.: *Relationi degli ambasciatori Veneti al Senato*, ser. iii, v. 1-3, "Relazioni degli stati Ottomani", Firenze, 1839-63.

ALI-ZĀDĒ, Abdul Kerim Ali-oğlu: "The agrarian system in Azerbaijan in the XIII-XIV centuries", *Ahlen des vierundzwanzigsten Orientalisten-Kongresses* (München, 28 Aug. - 4 Sept. 1957), ed. H. FRANKE, Wiesbaden, 1959.

ALLEN, William Edward David: *A history of the Georgian people from the beginning down to the Russian conquest in the nineteenth century*, London, 1932.

al-'Āmilī, Zain ad-Dīn "aṭ-Sāḥīd aṭ-Tānī" (d. 966/1558): *ar-Rauḍa al-bahīya bi-ṣark al-Lum'a ad-Dimašqīya* lith. Tabriz, 1275-76/1558-59.

AL-AMĪN, Muḥsin: *A'yān aṭ-Śī'a*, vols. i, vii, xi, xlii, and xiv, Beirut, 1380/1960-61.

ANŞĀRĪ, Saīḥ Čābir: *Tārīḥ-i Isfahān wa-Rayy*, Tehran, 1322/1944.

Āšiq-pālā-zādē (1400-1484): *Tawāriḥ-i Āl-i Osman*, ed. ALI BEY, Istanbul, 1332/1913-14.

AUBIN, Jean: "Comment Tamerlan prenait les villes", *Studia Islamica*, XIX (1963), pp. 83-122.

- , "Deux Sayyids de Bam au XV^e siècle: contribution à l'histoire de l'Iran Timouride", *Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur, Abhandlungen der Geistes- und Sozialwissenschaftlichen Klasse*, No. 7, 1956, pp. 373-501.
- , "Études Safavides I: Shāh Ismā'īl et les notables de l'Iraq persan", *Journal of the Economic and Social History of the Orient*, v. 2, pt. 1 (January 1959), pp. 37-81.
- , "Note sur quelques documents Aq-Qoyunlu", *Mélanges Louis Massignon*, v. I, Damas, 1956, pp. 123-147.
- , "Tamerlan à Bagdād", *Arabica*, IX (1962), pp. 303-309.

ĀYĀTĪ, Muhammed Husain: *Bahāristān dar Tārīḥ wa-tardīfim-i rigāl-i Qā'indī wa-Quhistān*, Tehran, 1327/1949.

'Azzāwī, 'Abbās: "Ta'līq 'alā maqāl Naṣīr ad-Dīn aṭ-Tūsī", *Maṭallat al-Maqma' al-'Ilmī al-'Arabi*, 37 (1962), pp. 207-215.

- , *al-Ta'rif bil-mu'arrīḥin*, v. I (The Mongol-Turkman period, 601-941/1204-1534), Bagdād, 1376/1957.
- , *Tārīḥ al-'Irāq bain Iḥtilālīn*, v. I, The Mongol government, Vol. II, The Čalāyir government, v. III, The Turkman governments; Bagdād, 1935-39.
- , *Tārīḥ an-nuqūd al-'Irāqīya*, Bagdād, 1377/1958.

- , *Tārīħ al-Yaridīya*, Bagdād, 1353/1935.
- BABINGER, Franz: "Marino Sanuto's Tagebücher als Quelle zur Geschichte der Ṣafawijja", in T. W. ARNOLD and R. A. NICHOLSON, *A Volume of Oriental Studies presented to Edward G. Browne*, Cambridge, 1922.
- , "Sari Saltik Dēdē", *EI*, first edition.
- , "Schejch Bedr ed-Din, der Sohn des Richters von Simaw", *Der Islam*, XI (1921), 1-106.
- BADR, Muṣṭafā Ṭāhā: *Mugūl Irān bain al-Masīhiya wal-Islām*, Cairo, n. d.
- al-Baghdādī, 'Abd Allāh ibn Fath Allāh, (15th cent.): *al-Tārīħ al-Giyāfī*, Bagdād, Iraqi Museum MS. 1738. [On this see Kurkis 'Awwād, *Sumer*, 13 (1957), p. 49; 'Azzāwī, *Ta'rif*, 249-51; and SCHMIDT-DUMONT, *Turkmeneische Herrscher* . . .].
- al-Bahrānī, Yūsuf ibn Ḥamad: *Lu'lū'at [lu'lū'atay?] al-Bahrānī*, Bombay, Mirzā Muḥammad Širāzī, n. d. (work completed in 1182/1768).
- al-Baidāwī, Nāṣir ad-Dīn 'Abd Allāh ibn 'Umar (d. ca. 1286): *Anwār al-tanzīl*, Cairo, 1330/1911; 4 pts. in 2 vols. (with commentary by AL-ḤATĪB AL-KĀZĀRŪNī).
- , *Chrestomathia Baidawiana*, (transl. of Sūra iii, Al 'Imrān), D. S. MARGOLIOUTH, London, 1894.
- , *Chrestomathia Baidawiana*, (transl. of Sūra xii, Yūsuf), E. F. F. BISHOP and Mohammad KADDAL, Glasgow, 1957.
- , *Niğām at-tawārib*, ed. Bahman Mirzā KARIMI, Tehran, 1313.
- BALA, Mirza: "Erdebil", 1A.
- Bar-Hebraeus, Gregorius Abū l-Faraġ (1226-1286): *Muqtasār ad-dawāl*, Beirut, 1890.
- BARBARO, Giosafat (d. 1494): *Travels to Tana and Persia*, Hakluyt, 1st ser. No. 49, London 1874. [This volume also contains *A Narrative of Italian travels in Persia in the 15th and 16th centuries*].
- BARTHOLD, Vasilii Vladimirovich (1869-1930): *Turkestan down to the Mongol Invasion*, 3rd edition, G. M. S., new ser. V, 1968.
- , *Four Studies on the history of Central Asia*, transl. by V. and T. MINORSKY, Leiden, 1958-1962. [v. I, A short history of Turkestan, and History of Semirechye; v. II, Ulugh-Beg; v. III, Mir Ali-Shir].
- BAUSANI, Alessandro: *Persia religiosa, da Zarathustra a Bahā'u'llāh*, Milan, 1959.
- , "Religion under the Mongols", being Chapter VII, pp. 538-549 of the *Cambridge History of Iran*, volume 5, The Saljuq and Mongol Periods, ed. by J. A. BOYLE, Cambridge, 1968.
- BAYĀNī, Ḥānbābā: *Chronique des Rois mongoles* . . ., see Abrū/BAYĀNī.
- BERCHET, Gugliemo (1833-1913): *La repubblica di Venesia et la Persia*, Torino, 1865.
- BIDLISI, Saraf-hān: *Scherefnameh, ou Histoire des Kurdes*, ed. V. VELIAMINOF-ZERNOF, St. Petersburg, 1860-1862, 2 vols. [Used: Arabic translation of this edition by Muḥammad 'Ali AUNI and Yahyā Al-ḤASĀB, Cairo, 1958-62].
- BINA-MOTLAGH, Mahmud: *Scheich Safi von Ardabil*; Göttingen University thesis, 1969, unpubli hed. [The present author had no opportunity of utilizing this thesis in his work].
- BIRGE, John Kingsley: *The Bektashi Order of Dervishes*, London, 1937.
- BLOCHET, Edgar: "La conquête des états nestoriens de l'Asie centrale par les Schiites: les influences Chrétiennes et Boudhiques dans le dogme islamique", Paris, 1926. (Extrait de la *Revue de l'Orient Chrétien*, XXV (1925-26), pp. 3-131).
- BOMBACI, Alessio: *Storia della letteratura Turca*, Napoli, 1956.
- BOUSQUET, Georges Henri: "Études islamologiques d'Ignaz Goldziher" (*Traductions Analytiques*, IV), *Arabica*, VIII (1961), 138-72.
- BROCKELMANN, Carl: *Geschichte der arabischen Literatur*, 2 vols and 3 supplements, Leiden, 1937-49.
- , *History of the Islamic peoples*, transl. by J. CARMICHAEL and M. PERLMANN, London, 1949.
- BROSSET, Marie Félicité [Brosse, Marii Ivanovich, 1802-1880]: *Collection d'historiens Arméniens*, 2 vols., St. Petersburg, 1876.
- BROWNE, Edward Granville: *A Catalogue of Persian MSS. in the Library of the University of Cambridge*, Cambridge, 1896.
- , *A Literary history of Persia*, 4 vols., Cambridge, 1902-24.
- , "Note on an apparently unique manuscript history of the Ṣafavī dynasty in Persia", *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*, 1921, pp. 395-418.
- BSOAS: Bulletin of the [London University] School of Oriental and African Studies.
- BURN, Richard: "Coins of Jahan Shah Kara Koyunlu and some contemporary rulers", *The Numismatic Chronicle and Journal of the Royal Numismatic Society*, 71 (1938), 173-197.
- BUSSE, Heribert: *Untersuchungen zum islamischen Kansleiwesen (an Hand turkmenischer und safawidischer Urkunden)*, Cairo, 1959, (Abhandlungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts Kairo, Islamische Reihe, Band 1).

CAHEN, Claude: "Bābā'i", *EI*, new edition.

CAJ: *Central Asian Journal*.

Cambridge History of Iran, The: Volume 5: The Saljuq and Mongol Periods, ed. by J. A. BOYLE, Cambridge, 1968.

CANARD, Marius: "al-Basāṣīrī, Abū al-Hārith Arslān al-Muẓaffar", *EI*, new edition.

CASKEL, Werner: "Ein Mahdi des 15. Jahrhunderts: Sajid Muhammad ibn Falah und seine Nachkommen", *Islamica*, IV (1929-31), 48-93.

-, "Die Wali's von Huwezeh", *Islamica*, VI (1933-34), 415-34.

CHENEB, Mohammad ben/SOMOGYI, J. de: "al-Dhahabi", *EI*, new edition.

CORBIN, Henry: *Terre céleste et corps de résurrection: de l'Iran māddé à l'Iran Shi'ite*, Paris, 1960.

ad-Dahabi, Muhammad ibn 'Utmān (d. 748/1348): *al-Muntaqā min Mīnhāq al-I'tidāl*, ed. Muhibb ad-Dīn AL-ḤĀFIẓ, Cairo, 1374/1954.

DĀHIR, Sulaimān: "Ṣilat al-'ilm baina Dimašq wa-Ğabal 'Āmil". *Maqallat al-Mağma' al-'Ilmi al-'Arabi*, Damascus, IX (1929), 269-79, and 341-54.

DĀNİŞPAZŪH, Muhammed Taqī: "Guftār az Ḥwāġa Ṭūsī bi-rawiš-i Bātīnlīyān", *Maqalla-yi Dāniškada-yi Adabiyāt*, Tabriz, III (1335/1957), p. 82 ff.

DARRĀBI, 'Abd ar-Rahīm Kalāntar: *Tārīħ-i Kašān*, Tehran, 1341/1963.

Dawwānī, Čalāl ad-Dīn (d. 908/1502-3): *Aḥlāq-i Čalālī*, transl. by W. T. THOMPSON as *The Practical philosophy of the Mohammedan People*, London, 1839.

DICKSON, Martin B.: [Review article of Laurence LOCKHART's] *The Fall of the Safawi Dynasty*, *JAOS*, 82 (1962), 503-517.

-, *Shah Tahmāsb and the Uzbeks: The duel for Khurāsān with 'Ubayd Khān*, 930-946/1524-1540: Princeton University thesis, May, 1958, unpublished.

DONALDSON, Dwight M.: *The Shi'ite Religion: A History of Islam in Persia and Irak*, London, 1933.

DORN, Boris Andreevich (Bernhard DORN, 1805-1881): *Mohammedanische Quellen zur Geschichte des Kaspiischen Meeres*, 4 vols., St. Petersburg, 1857-58. [Vol. I: 'All ibn Šams ad-Dīn ibn Ḥāfiẓ Husain, *Tārīħ-i Ḫāfiẓ*; Vol. II: 'Abd al-Fattāḥ Fūmani, *Tārīħ-i Gīlān*; Vol. III: Zāhir ad-Dīn ibn Naṣr ad-Dīn Mar'ašī, *Tārīħ-i Tabūristān wa-Rūyān wa-Māsandarān*; Vol. IV: Selections from various historians and geographers].

EBERHARD, Elke: *Ottomanische Polemik gegen die Safawiden im 16. Jahrhundert nach arabischen Handschriften*, (Islamkundliche Untersuchungen, Band 3), Freiburg im Breisgau, 1970. [This book appeared too late to be utilized in the present work].

EFENDIEV, O. A.: *Obrazovanie Azerbaydzhanskogo Gosudarstva Sefevidor v nachale XVI veka*, Baku, 1961. [This work contains photostatic reproductions of sections of the chronicle *Takmīlat al-ābbār*].

EI, first edition: *The Encyclopaedia of Islām*, first edition, 1913-1934 and *Supplement*, 1938.

EI, new edition: *The Encyclopaedia of Islām*, new edition, since 1960 (in progress).

ETHÉ, Hermann: *Catalogue of Persian MSS. in the Library of the India Office*, Oxford, 1903-28, 2 vols.

FALSAFI, Naṣr Allāh: *Zindigāni-yi Šāh 'Abbās-i Awwal*, vols. 1 and 2, Teheran 1332/1953.

Farhang-i Ğugrāfiyād-yi Irān, with preface by Sartip RAZMĀRĀ, 8 vols., Tehran, 1328-31/1949-52.

Fasā'ī, Hasan Husainī: *Tārīħ-i Fārsnāma-yi Nāṣiri*, lith., Tehran, 1313/1895-96; reprint 1961?

Faṣḥā of Ḥwāġī (d. 849/1445): *Muğmal-i Faṣḥā*, ed. Mahmūd FARRŪH, 3 vols., Mašhad, 1339/1961.

Feridūn, Ahmad Bey: *Munšā'at-i Salāfiñ*, 2 vols., Istanbul, 1274/1858.

FISCHEL, Walter Joseph: *Ibn Khaldūn and Tamerlane: Their historic meeting in Damascus*, 1401 A. D., University of California, 1952.

FISHER, Sydney Nettleton: *The Foreign Relations of Turkey, 1481-1512*, University of Illinois, Urbana, 1948.

FRYE, Richard Nelson: "Ardabil", *EI*, new edition.

Fūmani, 'Abd al-Fattāḥ: *Tārīħ-i Gīlān*, see DORN, B., *Mohammedanische Quellen*, volume II.

GABRIEL, Alfons: *Die Erforschung Persiens; die Entwicklung der abendländischen Kenntnis der Geographie Persiens*, Wien, 1952.

Ğa'far ibn Muhammed Husainī: [*Tārīħ-i Ğa'fari*], "Čand faṣl az Tārīħ-i Kabīr", ed. İraq Afşār, *Farhang-i Irān Zamīn*, VI (1337/1959), 89-158.

Gaffārī, Qāḍī Ahmadī (d. 973/1567-68): *Tārīħ-i Ğahān-ārā*, Tehran, 1343/1964.

GAL: *Geschichte der arabischen Litteratur*, see BROCKELMANN, Carl.

GAL, Suppl.: *Geschichte der arabischen Litteratur*, Supplements, see BROCKELMANN, Carl.

Ğāmī, 'Abd ar-Rahmān (1414-1492): *Lawdīh*, facsimile edition with transl. by E. H. WHINEFIELD and Muhammed-i Qazwīnī, London, 1928.

-, *Nafahat al-uns*, ed. Muhammad TAUHIDI-PUR, Tehran, 1336/1958.

Çannâbî: [Tuhfat al-adâb], selection in DORN, B., *Muhammadanische Quellen*, vol. IV, pp. 468-72.

ÇAWÂD, Muştafa: "İhtimâm Naşîr ad-Dîn at-Tûsî bi-ihya' at-taqâfa al-Islâmiya ayyâm al-Mugûl", *Yâd-nâma-yi Hwâja Naşîr ad-Dîn Tûsî*, vol. I, Tehran, 1336/1957, 86-115.

GIBB, Elias John Wilkinson: (1857-1901): *A History of Ottoman Poetry*, vols. I and II, London, 1900-1902. [6 vols. in all, edited by E. G. BROWNE, London 1900-1909].

GIBB, Hamilton Alexander Rosskeen: "The heritage of Islam in the modern world, II", *International Journal of Middle East Studies*, I, 3 (1970).

-, *The Travels of Ibn Battûta*; see under Ibn Battûta.

al-Giyât, pseud.: See al-Bağdâdi, 'Abd Allâh ibn Fath Allâh.

GLASSEN, Erika: *Die frühen Safawiden nach Qâfi Ahmad Qumi*, (Islamkundliche Untersuchungen, Band 5). Freiburg im Breisgau, 1970.

GMS: Gibb Memorial Series.

GÖKBÜLGİN, Tayyib: "Beylik", *EI*, new edition.

GOLDFINGER, Ignace: "Beiträge zur Litteraturgeschichte der Shî'a und der sunnitischen Polemik", *Sitzungsberichte der phil.-hist. Klasse der Kais. Ak. der Wiss.*, Wien LXXVII (1874), 439-524.

GÖLPINARLI, Abdulbaki: *Yunus Emre: Hayatı*, Istanbul, 1936.

al-Ğurğanî, as-Sayyid ab-Şârif (d. 816/1413): *Kitâb at-târifât*, Leipzig, 1845.

Ğuwâinfî, 'Atâ Malik (1226-1283): *Târih-i Ğâhân-gûşâ*, ed. Muhammad-i QAZWÎNÎ, Leiden/London, 1912-1937, 3 vols. (GMS. - 16).

Hâfiż-i Abrû: See Abrû, Hâfiż.

Halil [VINANÇ], Mükrimin: "Feridûn Beg Münâ'a'tî", *Türk Tarîk Encümeni Mecmuası*, Istanbul, IV, pts. 1-6, 1340/1921.

Hamd Allâh Mustaufî, Qazwînî: See Qazwînî, Hamd Allâh Mustaufî.

HAMMER-PURGSTALL, Joseph von (1774-1856): *Geschichte der Ilchane*, Darmstadt, 1842 (based on Târih-i Waqqâf).

-, *Histoire de l'Empire Ottoman*, transl. J. J. HELLERT, vol. II, Paris, 1835-43.

HİDAYAT, Rıdâ Qullî-hân: *Mağma' al-fusâ'il*, ed. M. MUŞAFFâ, Tehran, 1334/1956.

-, *Rauḍat as-sâfâ-yi Nâşîrî*, see Mirhwând, Rauḍat as-sâfâ, vols. 8-10.

al-Hillî, Ga'far ibn al-Hasan "al-Muhaqqiq al-Awwâl" (d. 676/1277): *Kitâb Şârî'i al-Islâm*; see QUERRY A., *Droit musulman* . . .

-, *al-Muhtasar an-nâfi' fi fiqh al-Imâmiya* (being a summary of the above), 2nd edition, Cairo, 1377/1957.

HINZ, Walther: *Irans Aufstieg zum Nationalstaat im fünfzehnten Jahrhundert*, Berlin and Leipzig, 1936.

-, "Quellenstudien zur Geschichte der Timuriden", *ZDMG*, 90 (1936).

HODGSON, Marshall G. S.: "How did the early Shî'a become sectarian?", *JAOS*, 75 (1955), pp. 1-13.

-, *The Order of Assassins*, The Hague, 1955.

HONIGMANN, Ernst: "Ortokids", *EI*, first edition. See also "Artukids" in *EI*, new edition.

HORST, Heribert: *Timûr und Högl 'Ali. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Safawiden*, Mainz, Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur; Abhandlungen der Geistes- und Sozialwissenschaftliche Klasse, Nr. 2, 1958.

HOWORTH, Sir Henry Hoyle (1842-1923): *History of the Mongols*, Pt. III: The Mongols in Persia; London, 1888.

HUART, Clément Imbault (1854-1926): "Ithnâ'ashariya", *Shorter Encycl. of Islam*.

Hudûd al-'Âlam, See MINORSKY, V.

Hungi, Faâl Allâh ibn Rûzbîhân: *Ibjâl nahâ al-bâsil wa-ihmâl haâf al-'âsil*, See Şüktarî, *Ihqâq*.

-, *Mihmân-nâma-yi Buhârâ*, ed. Manûcihr SUTUDA, Tehran, 1341/1963.

-, *Târih-i 'âlam-ârâ-yi Amîni*, abridged transl. by V. MINORSKY under the title *Persia in A. D. 1478-1490*, London, 1957.

Hungi/MINORSKY: *Persia* . . ., See Hungi, Târih-i 'âlam-ârâ . . .

Hwândamîr, Giyât ad-Dîn (1475-1536?): *Habîb as-siyâr fi abbâr afrâd al-bâšâr*, Tehran, 1333/1954-55, 4 vols.

Hwânsârî, Muhammad Bâqir (1811-1895): *Rauḍat al-ğannâl fi aħwâl al-'ulâma'* was-sâdât, 2nd edition by Muhammad 'Allî RAUPÂRÎ, lith., Tehran, 1367/1947.

IA: *Islam Ansiklopædisi*.

Ibn 'Arabî-Sâh, Ahmad ibn Muhammad (d. 854/1450): *'Aġâ'ib al-maqdûr fi abbâr Timûr*, Cairo, 1285/1868.

Ibn al-Atîr, 'Izz ad-Dîn (d. 632/1234): *al-Kâmil*, vol. 8, Cairo, al-Azhar edition, 1303/1885.

-, *Chronicon quod perfectissimum inscribitur*, v. 9, ed. C. J. TORNBERG, Leiden, 1863.

Ibn Baṭṭūṭa, Muḥammad ibn 'Abd Allāh (1304–1377): *Riḥla, Tuḥfat an-nuṣṣār fī ḡarḍ ib al-amṣār*, Beirut, 1960.

–, *The Travels of Ibn Battūṭah*, transl. by H. A. R. GIBB, The Hakluyt Society, ser. II, vol. 1–2 (1962).

Ibn Bazzāz, Tawakkul ibn Ismā'īl (14th c.): *Ṣafwat as-ṣaṣṭh*, done by Aḥmad ibn Karim TABRIZI, lith., Bombay, 1329/1911.

–, *Ṣafwat as-ṣaṣṭh*, India Office Ms. 1842. (See Ethé, *Cat. of Persian MSS.*, I, col. 1008).

Ibn Falāḥ, Muḥammad (15th c.): [*Kalām al-Mahdi*]. See KASRAWI, Mušaṣṣa'iyyān, pp. 124–28.

Ibn al-Fūṭi, 'Abd ar-Razzāq ibn Aḥmad (1244–1323): *al-Hawādīf al-ğāmi'a*, Bağdād, 1351/1932.

Ibn al-Fuwaṭi: See Ibn al-Fūṭi above.

Ibn Ḥaḡar al-Asqalānī, Aḥmad ibn 'Alī (d. 853/1449): *ad-Durar al-hāmina fī a'yān al-mi'a aṣ-ṣāmina*, 4 vols., Hyderabad, 1348–50/1929–31.

Ibn Ḥāggī Husain, 'Alī ibn Šams ad-Dīn: *Tārīħ-i ḥāni*; See DORN, B., *Mohammedanische Quellen* . . . , vol. 1.

Ibn Ḥaldūn (1332–1406): *Kitāb al-'Ibar* . . . , Cairo, Būlāq, 1284/1867, vol. 5.

–, *al-Muqaddima* (being book I of *Kitāb al-'Ibar*), Beirut, 1936.

–, *Sīd' as-sā'il li-takhlīb al-masā'il*, Istanbul, 1937.

–, *al-Ta'rif bi-Ibn Ḥaldūn wa-riḥlatihī ḡarban wa-ṣarqan*, ed. Muḥammad ibn Tāwīt Aṭ-ṬANCI, Cairo, 1951.

–, *Tārīħ*. See *Kitāb al-'Ibar*.

Ibn Iyās, Muḥammad ibn Aḥmad (d. 931/1524): *Badd'i' az-zuhūr fī waq'di' ad-duhūr*, Cairo, Būlāq, 1311/1893, 3 vols.

Ibn Kaṭīr, Ismā'īl ibn 'Umar (1301 – ca. 1373): *al-Biddāya wan-nihāya*, Cairo, 1358/1939.

Ibn al-Muṭahhar al-Ḫillī, al-Ḥasan ibn Yūsuf (d. 726/1326): *al-Bāb al-hādī-'asār*, (a treatise on the principles of Šī'ī theology), transl. by William MILLER, London, 1928.

–, *Kalf al-Murād*; See Ṭūsī, Naṣr ad-Dīn, *Taqṣīd al-i'tiqād*.

–, *Kitāb al-Ālafān al-fāriq bain as-sidq wal-mānī*, Naṣafī, 1372/1952.

–, *Minhāj al-karāma fī ma'rīfāt al-Imāma*, new edition, 1964 (in progress); see Ibn Taimīya, *Minhāj as-sunna*.

–, *Nahq al-haqqa*; see Sūstārī, *Ihqāq al-haqqa*.

–, *Qawā'id al-Īslām* (work ascribed to this author, but cannot be ascertained).

Ibn Rūzbihān: See Ḥunḍī, Faḍl Allāh ibn Rūzbihān.

Ibn as-Šīħna, Muḥammad: *Rauḍat al-mandīr*, (on the margin of vol. 11–12 of Ibn al-Āṭīr's *al-Kāmīl*, Cairo, 1303/1885).

Ibn Tagrī-birdī, Abū l-Mahāsin (d. 875/1470–71): *Hawādīf ad-duhūr*, ed. William POPPER, Berkeley, University of California Publications in Semitic Philology, 1930–42.

–, *al-Manhal as-sāfi*, Cairo, Dār al-Kutub, 1375/1956, vol. I (all published).

–, *an-Nuğūm as-sāhira*, ed. William POPPER, Berkeley, 1909–36.

Ibn Taimīya, Aḥmad (d. 728/1327–8): *'Aqīdat Ahl as-Sunna wal-Ğam'a*, ed. 'Abd ar-Rāziq 'Arfī, Cairo, 1358/1939.

–, *al-Furqān bain auliyyā' ar-Raḥmān wa-auliyyā' as-Šaiṭān*, Cairo, 1374/1955.

–, *Maғmū' ar-rasā'il*, Cairo, 1323/1905.

–, *Minhāj al-i'lāl fī naqqād halām Ahl ar-Raṣd wal-i'tibā'*; See Ibn Taimīya, *Minhāj as-sunna*.

–, *Minhāj as-sunna an-nabawīya fī naqqād halām as-Šī'a wal-Qadarīya*, Būlāq, Cairo, 1321/1903, 4 vols.

–, *Minhāj as-sunna* . . . , new edition, Cairo, 1964 (in progress). [Contains Ibn al-Muṭahhar's *Minhāj al-karāma* separately at the beginning of vol. I].

–, *ar-Radd 'alā r-Rēfiqī*, sec Ibn Taimīya, *Minhāj as-sunna*.

–, "Risāla fī r-radd 'alā n-Nuṣairīya"; see his *Maғmū' ar-rasā'il*, pp. 94–102.

–, *as-Ṣūfīya wal-suqād'*, Cairo, 1327/1909.

Ibn Taimīya/Dahabi: See ad-Dahabi, *al-Muntaqā*.

Ibn Ṭolūn, Šāms ad-Dīn Muḥammad (1483–1546): *al-A'imma al-iṣnā'asār*, ed. Ṣalāḥ ad-Dīn AL-MUNĀGGID, Beirut, 1958.

Ibn al-Wardī, Zain ad-Dīn (d. 1349): See Abū al-Fidā.

al-İğtī, 'Aqd ad-Dīn (d. 756/1355): *al-Mawdūqīs fī 'ilm al-halām*, Cairo, 1357/1938.

Index Iranicus: See Aršār, Irāq, *Fīhrīst-i maqādīs-i Fārsī*.

Iqbāl, 'Abbās: *Tārīħ-i muṣaṣṣal-i Irān*, vol. I (all published), Tehran, 1312/1933.

Iqtidārī, Aḥmad: *Laristān-i kuhan; taħqīq dar bāra-yi Laristān-i qadīm*, Tehran, 1334/1956.

Isfazārī (Iṣfazārī), Mu'īn ad-Dīn Muḥammad (fl. 1493): *Rauḍat al-ğannāt fī awṣāf madīnat-i Ḥarāt*, ed. Muḥammad Kāsim IMĀM, 2 vols., Tehran, 1339/1961.

Iskandar Beg Munšī: See Munšī, Iskandar Beg.

IVANOV, Vladimir Alekseevich: "An Ismailitic work by Naṣr al-Din al-Ṭūsī", *JRAS*, (1931), 527-64.

-, "Ismā'īliya", *Shorter Encyclopedia of Islam*.

-, *Maqmū'a-yi rasd'i wa - as'dr-i Ahl-i Haqq*, (English title-page: *The Truth worshippers of Kurdistan: Ahl-i Haqq texts*), Leiden, 1953.

İz, Fahir: "Ahmad Yasawī", *EI*, new edition.

JA: Journal Asiatique

JAOS: Journal of the American Oriental Society.

JORG (JORG), Nicolae (1871-1940): *Geschichte des Osmanischen Reiches*, 5 vols., Gotha, 1908-13.

JRAS: Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society.

JRCAS: Journal of the Royal Central Asian Society.

JUYNBOLL, Theodorus Willem: "Adhān", *EI*, first edition and new edition.

KAHĀLA, 'Umar Riḍā: *Mu'gam al-mu'allifin: Tarāfim muṣannifat al-kutub al-'Arabiya*, Damascus, 1957-1961, 15 vols.

KAHĀN, Maṣ'ud: *Cuğrâfiyâ-yi muṣassal-i İrân*, Tehran, 1310-11/1931-32, 3 vols.

KANTŪRÎ, I'ğaz Husain: *Kâfi al-ḥuqûb wal-astâr 'an asmâ' al-kutub wal-asfâr*, Calcutta, 1935.

KAŞANI, Suhalı: See Darrâbî, 'Abd ar-Rahîm Kalântar.

KASRAWI, Ahmad Tabrizî: *Muṣâ'fa'iyân, ya baṭṭî as-târîb-i Hâristân*, 2nd ed., Tehran, 1314/1936.

-, "Niżâd wa-tabâr-i Ṣafawîya", *Āyanda*, vol. II (1926-28), 357 ff., 489 ff., and 801 ff. (Subsequently appeared in book form: *Saiḥ Ṣafî wa-tabâraš*, Teheran 1963).

-, *Saiḥ Ṣafî wa-tabâraš*, Tehran, 1323/1944. (see above "Niżâd wa-tabâr-i Ṣafawîya").

-, *Târîb-i pâñşad sâla-yi Hâristân*, Tehran, 1313/1934.

-, *al-Taṣayyu' wa l-Sī'a*, Tehran, n. d.

AL-KÂZIMI, Muhammad Mahdi: *Minhâj al-Ṣâfi'a fi r-radd 'ala Ibn Taimiya*, Nağaf, 1346/1927, 2 vols.

KISSLING, Hans Joachim: "Badr al-Din b. Kâdî Samâwna", *EI*, new edition.

-, "The Social and educational role of the Dervish orders in the Ottoman Empire", *Studies in Islamic Cultural History*, The American Anthropological Association, v. 56, No. 2, Memoir No. 76 (April, 1954).

KÖPRÜLÜ, Mehmed Fuad: *Influence du Chamanisme Turco-Mongole*, Istanbul, 1929.

-, "Les origines du Bektaçhisme", *Actes des Congrès Int. d'Histoire des Religions*, II, Paris, 1925, pp. 391-411. (Also published separately, Paris, 1926, 25 pp.).

-, *Les origines de l'Empire Ottomane*, Paris, 1935.

-, [Review of] Zâhidî, *Silsilat an-nasab Ṣafawîya* in *Türkiyat Mecmuası*, vol. 2 (1926), Istanbul, 1928, pp. 579-581.

-, *Türk edebiyatında ilk mutasavvıflar*, Istanbul, 1918; detailed summary transl. by L. BOUVAT: "Les premiers mystiques dans la littérature turque", *Revue du Monde Musulman*, XLIII (1921), 236-282.

-, KÖPRÜLÜ/BOUVAT: See Koprülü, *Türk edebiyatında ...*

Kutubî, Mahmûd (fl. 1420): *Târîb-i Al-i Muṣaffâr*, Tehran, 1335/1956.

Lâhiğî, Sama ad-Dîn Muhammed: *Mafâthîh al-i'jâs fi Ṣârî* [Mahmûd Şabustari's] *Gülşân-i râz*, ed. Kaiwân SAMÎ'I, Tehran, 1337/1959.

LANE-POOLE, Stanley: *The Mohammadan Dynasties*, London, 1894.

LAOUST, Henri: *Essai sur les doctrines sociales et politiques de Takîd-Dîn Ahmad b. Taimiya*, Cairo, 1939.

LE STRANGE, Guy: *The Lands of the Eastern Caliphate*, Cambridge, 1905.

LEVY, Reuben (1891-1966): "The letters of Rashîd al-Dîn Faḍl Allâh", *JRAS*, (1946), 74-78.

LECH, Klaus: See al-'Umari, *Das mongolische Weltreich ...*

Lewis, Bernard: "Alî al-Ridâ", *EI*, new edition.

-, "'Alids'", *EI*, new edition.

-, *The Assassins: a radical sect in Islam*, London, 1967.

-, "Barak Bâbâ", *EI*, new edition.

-, *The Origins of Isma'ilism: a study of the historical background of the Fatimid Caliphate*, Cambridge, 1940.

-, "Some observations on the significance of heresy in the history of Islam", *Studia Islamica*, I (1953), 43-63.

LHP: *A Literary History of Persia*, See BROWNE, E. G.

LOCKHART, Laurence: *The Fall of the Safavi Dynasty and the Afghan Occupation of Persia*, Cambridge, 1958.

Mağdî, Mağd ad-Dîn Muhammed al-Ḥusainî al-Hâ'iri (fl. 1595): *Zînat al-mâfiâs*, Qum, 1342/1963. (Work completed in A. H. 1004).

Mağlisî, Muhammed Bâqîr (d. 1111/1699-1700): *Bîkâr*, lith. Tehran, 1303/1885.

- , *Bihār al-anwār*, new edition, by 'Abd ar-Rahīm AR-RABBĀNĪ AŠ-ŠIRĀZI, vol. I, Tehran, 1376/1956 – (in progress).
- , *Igāzīl al-Bihār* (being pt. 25–26 of the lith. edition of *Bihār*), Tehran, 1303/1885.
- MĀMAQĀNĪ, 'Abd Allāh ibn Muḥammad Ḥasan (1873–1932): *Tanqīh al-maqāl fī aḥwāl ar-riḍāl*, Naṣaf, 1349–52/1930–33, 3 vols.
- MANS, Raphael du (1613–1696): *Estat de la Perse en 1660*, ed. Ch. SCHIFFER, Paris 1890.
- al-Maqrizī, Ahmad ibn 'All (d. 846/1442): *Kitāb al-Hijāf*, Beirut, 1959.
- , *Kitāb al-Hijāf*, Cairo, 1326/1908.
- , *as-Sulūk li-ma'rīfat duwal al-mulūk*, ed. M. ZIYĀDA, Cairo, vol. I, pt. 2 (1936), pt. 3 (1939), and Annexes to v. I, Nos. 7 and 12–16, and vol. Pt. I.
- Mar'ašī, Zāhir ad-Dīn ibn Naṣr ad-Dīn: See DORN, B., *Mohammedanische Quellen*, vol. III.
- , *Tārīħ-i Tabārīstān wa-Rūyān wa-Māzandarān*, new ed., Tehran, 1333/1955.
- , *Tārīħ-i Gilān wa-Dailamistān*, Rašt, 1330/1952.
- MARGOLIOUTH, David Samuel (1858–1940): *Chrestomathia Baidawiana*, see Baidāwī.
- , *The Place of Persia in the history of Islam*, London, 1925.
- , *Maqām-i Irān dar Tārīħ-i Islām*, transl. by Rašīd Yāsīnī, Tehran, 1321/1943.
- MASSÉ, Henri: "Ordonnance rendue par le prince Ilkanien Ahmad Jalair en faveur du Cheikh Sadr-od-din, 1305–1392", *J.A.*, 230 (1938), 465–68.
- MILLER, William: *Trebizond, the last Greek empire*, London, 1926.
- MINORSKY, Vladimir Fedorovich (1877–1966): "Ādharbaydjān", *EJ*, new edition.
- , "A Civil and military review in Fārs in 881/1476", *BSOAS*, X (1940–1943), 141–178.
- , "Les Études historiques et géographiques sur la Perse", *Acta Orientalia*, 10 (1932), 178–83; 16 (1938), 49–58; 21 (1950–53), 108–123; and 22 (1957), 105–117.
- , *Four Studies on the History of Central Asia*, see BARTHOLD, V.
- , *A History of Sharwān and Darband in the 10th–11th centuries*, Cambridge, 1958.
- , *Hudūd al-'Ālam, the regions of the world: a Persian geography*, 372 A. H./982 A. D., transl. and explained by V. MINORSKY, London, 1937. (GMS, new ser., II).
- , "Iran: Opposition, martyrdom and revolt", in *Unity and variety in Muslim civilization*, ed. G. von GRUNEBEAUM, University of Chicago, 1955, pp. 183–206.
- , "Jihān-Shāh Qara-qoyunu and his poetry", (*Turkmenica* 9), *BSOAS*, XVI (1954), 271–97.
- , "The Middle East in Western politics in the 13th, 15th, and 17th centuries", *JRCAS*, XXVII (1940), 427–61.
- , "A Mongol decree of 720/1320 to the family of Shaykh Zāhid", *BSOAS*, XVI (1954), 515–527.
- , "Musha'ba'", *EJ*, first edition, Supplement.
- , "Naṣr al-Dīn Ṭūsī on Finance", see MINÖVI/MINORSKY.
- , *Persia in A. D. 1478–1490*. See Hungī, *Tārīħ-i 'Ālam-ard* . . .
- , "The Poetry of Shāh Ismā'il I", *BSOAS*, X (1940–43), pp. 1006a–1053a.
- , Review of W. HINZ's *Irans Aufstieg . . .*, *BSOAS*, IX (1937–39), 239–43.
- , "Shaykh Bālī Efendi on the Ṣafavids", *BSOAS*, XX (1957), 437–450.
- , *Studies in Caucasian History*, London 1953.
- , "Sultānīya", *EJ*, first edition.
- , *Tadhhīrat al-mulūk: A Manual of Ṣafavid Administration (ca. 1137/1725)*, transl. and explained by V. MINORSKY, London, 1943. (GMS, new ser., 16).
- , "Tawakkul ibn Bazzāz", *EJ*, first edition.
- , "Thomas of Metzop' and the Timūrid-Turkman wars", *Prof. Muḥammad Shaft' Presentation Volume*, Lahore, 1955.
- , "Turkmenica" [listed in *BSOAS*, XVI (1954), p. 271; four other articles are mentioned in the Foreword to his *Persia* . . .].
- , "Uzūn Hasan", *EJ*, first edition.
- MINÖVI/MINORSKY: "Naṣr al-Dīn Ṭūsī on Finance", by Muğtabā MINÖVI and V. MINORSKY, *BSOAS*, X (1940–43), 755–789.
- MIRHWĀND (d. 1498): *Raudat as-ṣafā*, Tehran, 1338–39/1960, 10 vols., (the last three volumes being *Raudat as-ṣafā-yi Nāṣirī*, by Rīdā Qullī-bān Hidāyat).
- MOLÉ, M.: "Les Kubrawiya entre Sunnisme et Shiisme aux huitième et neuvième siècles de l'Hégire", *Revue des Études Islamiques*, XXIX (1961), 61–142.
- , "Naqshbandīyāt", *Farhang-i Irān Zamīn*, VI (1337/1959).
- MORDTMANN, Johannes H. / MÉNAGE, V. L.: "Dhu 'l-Kadr", *EJ*, new edition.

MOSCATTI, Sabatino: "Per una storia dell'antica Šī'a", *RSO.*, 30 (1955), pp. 252-67.

MU'IN, Muhammad: *Hāfiż-i Šīrīn-suḥān*, Tehran, 1319/1941.

MUNAĞGİD, Ṣalāḥ ad-Dīn al-: *al-Mu'arriḥūn ad-Dimashqīyūn wa-dīfāruhūm al-maḥfūṣa*, Cairo, 1956.

Munağgim-bābī, Ahmād ibn Luṭf Allāh (d. 1113/1702): *Şahā'if al-abbār* [a summary translation in Turkish of his *Gāmi'* *ad-duwāl*] by Nedim Aḥmed Efendi, Istanbul, 1285/1868, 3 vols.

Munālī, Iskandar Beg: *Tārīḥ-i 'Alām-ārā-yi 'Abbāsī*, Tehran, 1334-35/1956-1957, 2 vols.

Murtaẓawī, Manūčehr: "Dīn wa-Maqhab dar 'ahd-i Ilhāniyān-i Irān", *Nāṣīra-yi Dāniškada-yi Adabiyāt*, Tabriz, X (1337/1959), 17-80.

- , *Taqṣīq dar bāra-yi daura-yi Ilhāniyān Irān* (*Dīn, maqhab, taṣawwuf, tārīḥ-nawīsī, muqallidīn-i Sāhnāma*), Tehran, 1341/1963-64.
- , "Takmila bar maqāla-yi dīn wa-maqhab dar 'ahd-i Ilhāniyān-i Irān", *Maqalla-yi Dāniškada-yi Adabiyāt*, Tabriz, XI (1338/1960), 160-84.
- , "Taṣawwuf dar daura-yi Ilhāniyān", *Maqalla-yi Dāniškada-yi Adabiyāt*, Tabriz, IX (1336/1958), 297-337.

Mušār, Ḥānbābā: *Mu'allifin-i kutub-i īāpi-yi Fārsī wa 'Arabi*, Tehran, 1340/1962, 2 vols.

Nahrawālī, Qutb ad-Dīn Muḥammad ibn Ahmād (d. 988/1580-81): *Kitāb al-i'lām* (*Tārīḥ al-Qutbī al-mu-sammā Kitāb al-i'lām bi-a'lām Bait Allāh al-kārām fi tārīḥ Makkā*), Mecca, 1370/1950-51.

an-Naḡāṣī, Shīhāb ad-Dīn: "Kitāb al-la'ālī" al-muntaẓima wad-durār at-ṭamīna", see Šūṭarī, *Iḥqāq al-haqqa* vol. I.

Nāma-yi Dānišwārān-i Nāṣīrī, dar Šāh-i ḥāl-i šāṣṭād tan as dānišmandān-i nāmī, 2nd edition, Qum, 1338/1379/1960, 4 vols.

Nawā'ī, 'Abd al-Ḥusain, ed.: *Asnād wa-mukātabāt-i tārīḥ-i Irān az Timūr tā Šāh Ismā'īl*, Tehran, 1341/1963-64.

Nawā'ī, Mir 'Ali Šīr: *Maqālis an-naṣī'is*, (two Persian translations), ed. 'Ali Asḡar HIKMAT, Tehran, 1323/1945.

NICHOLSON, Reynold Alleyne (1868-1945): *Selected Odes from the Divān-i Shams-i Tabris*, ed. and transl. by R. A. NICHOLSON, Cambridge, 1898.

NIKITINE, Basil: "Essai d'analyse du Ṣafvat-uṣ-Ṣafā", *JA*, 245 (1957), pp. 385-94.

OHSSON, Constantin Mouradgea d' (1779-1851): *Histoire des Mongols depuis Tchinguiz-Khan jusqu'à Timour Bey ou Tamerlan*, Vol. III, The Hague, 1834.

PALOMBINI, Barbara von: *Bündniswerben abendländischer Mächte um Persien 1453-1600*, (Freiburger Islamstudien, Band 1), Wiesbaden, 1968.

PARRY, V. J.: "Bāyzād II", *EI*, new edition.

PARWIZI, Šams ad-Dīn: *Kitāb Taqhirat al-awliyā'*, Tabriz, 1332/1373/1953-54.

PEGOLOTTI, Francesco Balducci: *La Pratica della Mercatura*, ed. Allan EVANS, Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1936.

PETRUSHEVSKII, Ilia Pavlovich: "K woprosu o podlinnosti perepiski Rašid ad-dina", *Westnik Leningrad-shojo Universiteta*, 1948, N. 9.

- , "Nahḍat-i Sarbadārān dar Ḥurāsān", transl. by Karim KİŞAWARZ, *Farhang-i Irān-Zamin*, X (1962), 124-224.

POLIAK, A. N.: "Les révoltes populaires en Égypte à l'époque des Mamelouks et leurs Causes économiques". *Revue des Études Islamiques*, VIII (1934), 255 ff.

POLO, Marco: *The Description of the World*, ed. A. C. MOULÉ and Paul PELLION, London, 1938.

POPPER, William: *Egypt and Syria under the Circassian Sultans, 1382-1468*: (Systematic notes to Ibn Taghrī Birdī's Chronicles of Egypt), University of California Publications in Semitic Philology, XV, Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1955.

Qādī Nūr Allāh: See Šūṭarī, Qādī Nūr Allāh.

al-Qalqaṣāndī, Ahmād ibn 'All (d. 821/1418): *Šubb al-a'sā fi sind'at al-inṣā*, vol. 13, Cairo, 1918.

Qaramānī, Ahmād ibn Yūsuf ibn Ahmād: *Kitāb Aḥbār ad-duwāl wa-dījār al-uwal*, lith. Baġdād, 1282/1865 (work completed in 1008/1599).

Qāsim-i Anwār (1356-1433): *Kulliyāt-i Qāsim-i Anwār*, ed. Sa'īd NAFISI, Tehran, 1337/1959.

Qazwīnī, Ḥamd Allāh Mustāṣfī (fl. 1330-1340): *Nuṣhat al-qulāb*, edited by Muḥammad Dābir-SIVĀQI, Tehran, 1336/1957.

- , *Tārīḥ-i gurida*, London and Leiden, 1910-13, 2 vols.

QAZWĪNĪ, Muḥammad: "Farmān-i Sultān Ahmād Jalāyir", *Yādīgār*, I, No. 4, Tehran, 1323/1945, pp. 25-29.

- , *Yaddāshth*, Tehran, 1332-1347/1954-1969, 9 vols.

Qazwīnī, Yahyā ibn 'Abd al-Latīf (d. 960/1552): *Lubb at-tawārīḥ*, Tehran, 1314/1932.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

QUERRY, Amédée: *Droit musulman: Recueil des lois concernant les musulmans schyites*, 2 vols., Paris, 1871-72; [see also al-Hilli, Ġa'far ibn al-Hasan, *Kitāb Ṣādī' al-Islām*].

QUMMI, 'Abbās (1877-1941): *Fawd'id ar-radawiya fī aḥwāl 'ulamā' al-maqhab al-Ğa'fariya*, Tehran, 1327/1949.

Qummi, Hasan ibn Muhammad: *Kitāb Tarīb-i Qum*, Tehran, 1313/1935.

Raṣīd ad-Dīn Faḍl Allāh, Ṭabīb (1247-1318): *Fawd'id-i Sulṭāniya*, see TOGAN, Z. V., "The Composition of the History of the Mongols", *CAJ*, VII, 1, (1962), 60 ff.

- , *Faṣlī as-Ğāmī' at-tawārīḥ* (Ismā'iliyyān . . .), ed. Muḥammad Taqī Dānišpažūh, Tehran, 1339/1960.
- , *Geschichte Gāsān-Hān*, ed. K. JAHN, London, 1940. (GMS new ser., 14).
- , *Ğāmī' at-tawārīḥ*, ed. E. BLOCHET, London/Leiden, 1911. (GMS 18, pt. 2).
- , *Muḥkābatūl-i Raṣīdī*, ed. Muḥammad Šāfi', Lahore, 1376/1947.

Rauḍātī, Muḥammad 'All: *Ğāmī' al-ansāb*, v. I: Ḥāndānhā-yi Sādāt-i Mūsawī, Isfahan, 1335/1376/1957.

Rāżwī, Muḥammad Taqī Mudarrīs: *Aḥwāl wa ădār ḥudāgā Naṣīr-i Tūsī*, Tehran, 1334/1955.

Rāzī, Aḥmad Amin (fl. 1594): *Hast iqlīm*, Tehran, n. d., 3 vols.

RIBU, Charles: *Catalogue of the Persian MSS. in the British Museum*, London, 1879-83, 3 vols and Supplement, London, 1895.

RITTER, Hellmut: "Djalāl al-Dīn Rūmī", *EI*, new edition.

ROBSON, James: "al-Baīdawī", *EI*, new edition.

ROEMER, Hans Robert: "Die Ṣafawiden", *Saeclum*, IV (1953), 27-44.

ROSS, Edward Denison (1871-1940): "The Anonymous history of Shāh Ismā'īl", *JRAS*, 1896, pp. 249-340.

- , *Both Ends of the Candle* (an autobiography), London, 1943.

RSO: *Revista degli Studi Orientali*.

Rūmī, Galāl ad-Dīn, Maulānā (1207-1273): *Kulliyāt-i Šams-i Tabrīzī*, ed. Badī' az-Zamān Furūzānfar and 'All Daštī, Tehran, 1336/1958.

Rūmī, Ḥasan: *Aḥsan al-tawārīḥ: A chronicle of the early Safawis*, ed. and transl. C. N. SEDDON, Baroda, 1931-34, 2 vols.

ŞABİTİYĀN, D.: *Asnād wa-nāmahā-yi tārīhi-yi daura-yi Ṣafawīya*, Tehran, 1343/1965.

SAĞGĀDĪYA, Ğawād: "Nā-būdan-i ta'aşşub-i mađhabī dar daura-yi Muğol", *Naṣīriya-yi Dānišhada-yi Ada-biyāt*, Tabriz, XI (1338/1959), 151-59.

as-Sāḥawī, Muḥammad ibn 'Abd ar-Rahmān (1427-1497): *aq-Dau' al-lāmī' li-ahl al-qarn at-tāsi'*, Cairo, 1353-55/1934-36, 12 vols.

Sām Mirzā (d. 984/1576-7): *Tuhfa-yi Sāmī*, Tehran, 1314/1936.

Samarqandī, Kamāl ad-Dīn 'Abd ar-Razzāq (1413-1482): *Maṭla' as-Sā'dain wa-maġma' al-bahrain*, ed. Muḥammad Šāfi', Lahore, 1941-49, 2 vols.

Sāmī, Niżām ad-Dīn: *Zafar-nāma: Histoire des conquêtes de Tamerlan*, ed. F. TAUER, Prague, 1937-56, 2 vols.

ŠAMS AD-DĪN, Muḥammad Riḍā: *Hayāt al-Imām al-Ṣahīd al-Awwāl* [Muḥammad ibn Makki al-Āmilī], an-Naġaf, 1376/1957.

SANUTO, Marino (1466-1535): *I diarii di Marino Sanuto*, ed R. FULIN and others, with "Prefazione" by G. BERCHET, Venezia, 1879-1903, 58 vols.

Saraf-ḥan Bidīslī: See Bidīslī, Saraf-ḥan.

as-ŞARRĀF, Aḥmad Ḥāmid: *al-Šabak min firaq al-gulāt fī al-'Irāq*, Bağdād, 1373/1954.

SARWAR, Ghulam: *History of Shāh Ismā'īl Ṣafawī*, Aligarh, 1939.

SAVORY, Roger M.: "Cübānids", *EI*, new edition.

- , "The struggle for supremacy in Persia after the death of Timur", *Der Islam*, 40 (1964), No. 1, pp. 35-65.

SAYAR, I. M.: Review of V. A. GORDLEVSKY's *The Empire of the Saljuqs of Asia Minor*, in *Journal of Near Eastern Studies*, X (1951).

SCHILTBURGER, Johann: *The Bondage and travels of Johann Schiltberger*, transl. by J. B. TELFER, Hakluyt series, i, 58 (1878).

SCHMIDT-DUMONT, Marianne: *Turkmenische Herrscher des 15. Jahrhunderts in Persien und Mesopotamien nach dem Tārīħ al-Gīyāħī*, (Islamkundliche Untersuchungen, Band 6), Freiburg im Breisgau, 1970. [This thesis appeared too late for the present author to utilize in his work].

SEDDON, Charles Norman: "Hasan-i Rūmī's Aḥsan al-Tavārīkh", *JRAS* (1927) pp. 307-313.

- , *Aḥsan al-tawārīḥ*, See Rūmī, Ḥasan.

Shorter Encyclopaedia of Islam, Leiden, 1945.

SIOUSSI, Nicolas (1829-1901): "Notice sur le cachet du Sultan Mogol Oldjaitou Khodabendeh", *JA*, ser. 9, No. 8 (1896), 331-345.

SÖHRWEIDE, Hanna: "Der Sieg der Safawiden in Persien und seine Rückwirkungen auf die Schiiten Anatoliens im 16. Jahrhundert", *Der Islam*, 41 (1965) pp. 95-223.

SMITH, J. M.: "Djalayir, Djalayirid", *EI*, new edition.

SPULER, Bertold: *Die Mongolen in Iran: Politik, Verwaltung, und Kultur der Ilchanzeit, 1220-1350*, 2nd edition, Berlin, 1955.

- , "La situation de l'Iran à l'époque de Marco Polo", *Oriente Poliano*, Rome, 1957, pp. 121-132.

STOREY, Charles Ambrose: *Persian Literature: a bio-bibliographical survey*, London, 1927-1958.

STROTHMANN, Rudolf: "Sab'īya", "Shī'a", and "al-Zaidīya", in *Shorter Encycl. of Islam*.

- , "Schiiten und Charidschiten", in *Handbuch der Orientalistik*, VIII/2, Leiden and Köln, 1961, pp. 476-95.
- , "Takīya", *Shorter Encycl. of Islam*.
- , "al-Ṭūsī", *EI*, first edition.

as-SUBKI, Tāq ad-Dīn (d. 1370): *Tabaqāt as-Ṣāfi'īya al-kubrā*, Cairo, 1324/1906.

SURŪR, Muḥammad Čamāl ad-Dīn: *Daulat Banī Qalawūn fi Miṣr*, Cairo, 1947.

SÜŞTARI, Muhammed 'Alī Imām: *Tārīkh-i Ğugvāsiyā-yi Ḥaristān*, Tehran, 1331/1953.

SÜŞTARI, Qādi Nūr Allāh: *Iḥqāq al-haqqa*, Tehran, 1376/1956 (in progress).

- , *Mağlis al-mu'minīn*, Tehran, lith., 1299/1881-82. New edition: Tehran 1375/76.

TAESCHNER, Franz: "Anadolu", "Āshik-pāshā-zādē", and "Elbistān", *EI*, new edition.

TAFTAZĀNĪ, Sa'd ad-Dīn (d. 792/1389 or 798/1395): *Risāla fi waḥdat al-wujūd*, Istanbul, 1294/1877.

at-TAHĀWI, Abu Ča'far Aḥmad (d. 321/933): *Aqīdat Ahl as-Sunna wal-Ğam'a*, transl. E. E. ELDER in *The Macdonald Presentation Volume*, Princeton, 1933.

Tahmilat al-ājbār: See Efendiev, O. A.

T.M.: *Tadhhīrat al-mulūk*, See Minorsky, V.

TARBIYAT, Muhammed 'Alī: *Dānişmandān-i Ādarbaigān*, Tehran, 1314/1936.

TAŞKÜPÜRÜ-ZADE, Aḥmad (d. 996/1561): *as-Ṣaqdīq an-nu'māniya* (on the margin of Ibn Ḥallikān, *Wafayāt al-a'yān*, Būlaq, 1300/1882).

TAUER, Felix: *Cinq opuscules . . . , see Abrū, Hāfiẓ.*

Tawakkul ibn Ismā'īl ibn Ḥāfiẓ al-Ardabīlī: See Ibn Bazzāz.

TEVFİK, Riza: "Étude sur la religion des Houroufis", in *Textes persan relatifs à la secte des Houroufis*. GMS, IX (1909).

TİHRĀNÎ, Abū Bakr: *Tārīkh-i Diyārbakriya*, ed. Faruk SÜMER and Necati LUGAL, Ankara, 1962-64.

TOGAN, Zeki Velidi: "The composition of the History of the Mongols by Rashid al-Dīn", *Central Asian Journal*, VII (March 1962), 60-72.

- , "Londra ve Tahrandaki İslami yazmalardan bazilarına dair", *İslam tarihçileri Enstitüsü Dergisi*, III, pts. 1-2 (1959-60), Istanbul, 1960.
- , "The Rise of the Turkish Empire", in *Background of the Middle East*, ed. JACKH, 1952.
- , "Sur l'origine des Šafavides", *Mélanges Massignon*, III, Damas, 1959, pp. 345-357.
- , *Tarihde usul*, Istanbul, 1950.
- , *Umumi Türk tarihine giriş*, Cild I: *En eski devirlərdən 16. asra kədər*, Istanbul, 1946.

TOYNBEE, Arnold J.: *A Study of History*, Galaxy ed'n, New York, 1962: "The schism in the Iranic world . . .", vol. I, 347-402.

TSCHUDI, Rudolf: "Bektāshīyya", *EI*, new edition.

AT-TUNAKĀBŪNī, Muhammed ibn Sulaimān (d. 1890-91): *Qiyās al-'ulamā'*, Tehran, n. d.

at-ṬŪSī, Abū Ča'far Muhammed ibn al-Ḥasan "Šāih at-Ṭā'iṣ": *Fīhrīst ḥukūb as-Ṣī'a*, ed. A. SPRENGER, Calcutta, 1853.

at-ṬŪSī, Naṣīr ad-Dīn (1201-1273): *Aḥlāq-i Naṣīrī*, Lahore, 1952.

- , *Dawādīdah-i Imām . . .* (MS, see RAZĀWI, Muhammed Taqī Mudarris, *Aḥwāl wa-āṣīr . . .*, pp. 317-18).
- , *Fuṣūl-i Ḥwāḍī-yi Ṭūsī*, ed. Muhammed Taqī DĀNIŞ-PAZŪH, Tehran, 1335/1956.
- , *The Nasirean Ethics*, (a translation of Ṭūsī's *Aḥlāq*) by G. M. WICKENS, London, 1964.
- , *Risāla-yi Imāmat*, ed. Muhammed Taqī DĀNIŞ-PAZŪH, Tehran, 1335/1956.
- , *Taqīd al-'aqd'id* [or *al-kalām*]: commentary by Ibn al-Muṭahhar al-Hillī: *Kaṣf al-murād fi ḫarāq taqīd al-'iṭiqād*, Qum, 1372/1952.
- , *Tasawwurūt or Rauḍat al-taslim*, ed. V. IVANOW, Leiden, 1950. (See also above, IVANOW: "An Ismā'īlitic work . . .").

TYAN, Émile: "Djihād", *EI*, new edition.

al-'ULĀIMI, Muğīr ad-Dīn: *al-Uṣūl bi-tārīḥ al-Quds wal-Ḥalīl*, Cairo, 1283/1866-67, 2 vols. (Incomplete translation by H. SAUVAIRE: *Histoire de Jérusalem et d'Hébron*, Paris, 1876).

al-'UMARĪ, Sīhāb ad-Dīn Ibn Faḍl Allāh (1301-1349): [Masālik al-abṣār, as used by Qalqālanī in *Şubh al-a'yd*].

- , *Das mongolische Weltreich*, al-'Umarī's Darstellung der mongolischen Reiche in seinem Werk *Masdīk al-abṣar fi mamālik al-amṣār*, mit Paraphrase und Kommentar, herausgegeben von Klaus LECH, Wiesbaden, 1968.
- , *al-Ta'rif bil-musṭalaḥ aš-ṣarīf*, Cairo, 1312/1894.
'Umarī/LECH: See al-'Umarī, *Das mongolische Weltreich* . . .
- UZUNÇARŞILI, İsmail Hakkı: *Osmānī Tarihi*, I. Cild, 2. Baskı, Ankara, 1961.
- WALSH, J. R.: "Yūnus Emré: a 14th century Turkish hymnodist", *Numen*, VII, 1960.
- WANSROUCH, John: "A Mamlūk letter of 877/1473", *BSOAS*, 24 (1961), 200–213.
- Wassāf [Wassāf al-ḥadra], 'Abd Allāh ibn Fadl Allāh, (14th c.): *Geschichte Vassafs*, ed. HAMMER-PURGSTALL, Wien, 1856.
- , *Tārīħ-i Wassāf*, lith. Bombay, 1249/1833; reprinted 1338/1960 (Tehran?).
- WAZĪR-I-VI KIRMĀNī, Ahmad 'Alī Ḥāfi: *Tārīħ-i Kirmān*, Tehran, 1340/1961.
- WICKENS, George Michael: *The Nasirean Ethics*, see Tūsl, Naṣr ad-Dīn.
- WITTEK, Paul: *The Rise of the Ottoman Empire*, London, Luzac, 1938.
- , "Yazijioglu 'All' on the Christian Turks of the Dobruja", *BSOAS* 14 (1952).
- al-Yāfi'I, 'Abd Allāh ibn As'ad (d. 768/1366): *Mir'at al-ғinān wa-'ibrat al-yaqẓān*, Hyderabad, 1339/1920.
- YALTAKAYA, M. Şerefeddin: "Bedreddin", *IA*.
- Yāqūt ibn 'Abd Allāh al-Hamawī, (1179–1229): *Mu'gām al-buldān*, ed. F. WÜSTENFELD, Göttingen, 1866, 6 vols.
- Yazdī, Ṣaraf ad-Dīn 'All: *Zafar-nāma*, ed. Muḥammad 'Abbāsī, Tehran, 1336/1957, 2 vols.
- YINANÇ: see HALİL
- Zāhidī, Husain ibn Abdāl: *Silsilat an-nasab Ṣafawiya*, Berlin, 1342/1924.
- ZDMG: *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft*.
- ZIRIKLI, Hair ad-Dīn: *al-A'lām: Qāmūs tarḍīġim li-ašhar ar-rīḍāl . . .*, Cairo, 1954–59, 10 vols.
- ZİYĀDA, Muḥammad Muṣṭafā: *al-Mu'arriḥūn fi Miṣr fi l-qarn al-hāmis-aśar*, Cairo, 1954.
- AZ-ZU'Bī, Muḥammad 'All: *Lā Sunna wa-lā Šī'a*, Beirut, 1961.

INDICES

I. PROPER NAMES, Persons, and Peoples

'Abbâs I, Sâh of Iran, 47
 Abhâr, Sayyid Rukn ad-Dîn,
 33
 Abû Bakr (Caliph), 29, 34
 Abû Hanîfa, 49
 Abû Sa'îd (Ilhânîd Sultân), 3, 8,
 9, 17, 39, 40, 56, 57, 64, 71
 Abû Sa'îd (Tîmûrid Sultân), 10,
 11, 17, 79
 Ahmed, Çalâyir Sultân, 9, 10,
 45 n. 3, 53 n. 6, 64, 66
 Ahmed, Mir (son of Ra'd ad-
 Dîn Faqîl Allâh), 53
 Ahmed Takudâr (Mongol Sul-
 tân), 39
 'Alâ' ad-Dîn Kaikubâd III
 (Rûm Selçûq Sultân), 8
 'Alâ' ad-Dîn Muhammed (Is-
 mâ'îl ruler), 26
 'Ali ibn Abî Tâlib, 1, 3, 29, 34,
 35, 36, 44, 50, 52, 53, 57, 60,
 62, 64 n. 2, 66, 70, 73, 75, 78,
 85
 'Ali ibn 'Isâ (vizir to al-Muqtâ-
 dir), 1
 'Ali ibn Muhsin (Muâsa'sâ'), 70
 'Ali ibn Nâmâwar, 25
 'Ali, Maulâ (Muâsa'sâ'), 69
 'Ali Pâdişâh, Sultân (of Arda-
 bîl), 43, 51, 72, 78, 79
 'Ali ar-Ridâ, 8th Imâm, 3, 50
 Alwand (Aq-qoyunlu ruler), 79,
 81, 82
 Anwâr, see Qâsim-i Anwâr
 Äq Sams ad-Dîn, 60
 Ardabîl, see Şâfi ad-Dîn
 Argûn-hân, Mongol Sultân, 24,
 36 n. 6
 Aristotle, 35
 Aş'arî, Abû l-Hasan, 36
 Aşraf, Malik (Çübânîd), 54 n. 2
 'Atâ Malik Ğuwainî, see Guwai-
 ni
 'Attâr (the poet), 60
 'Awâq (ancestor of Şâfi Şâfi ad-
 Dîn), 51
 Ayyûb ibn Muhsin (Muâsa'sâ').
 70
 'Azîz, Darwîş (Sarbadâr), 67
 Bâbâ İshâq (Rasûl Allâh), 60,
 61 n. 4, 62
 Bâbur, 79
 Badr ad-Dîn, Qâdi of Samâwnâ,
 3, 60, 62
 Baibars, see al-Malik az-Zâhir
 Baidâwi, Qâdi Nâsi' ad-Dîn, 23,
 36 ff., 38, 41, 59
 Barâq Bâbâ, 60, 62
 Barnîqî, Sams ad-Dîn, 53 n. 4

Basâsîrî, Hasan (Turkish gene-
 ral), 2
 Bâyezîd I, Yıldırım (Ottoman
 Sultân), 11, 54, 63
 Bâyezîd II (Ottoman Sultân), 9,
 78, 81
 Bairam Wallî, Hâggî, 60
 Bektaş, Hâggî, 60, 61, 62
 Burhan ad-Dîn, Qâdi of Siwâs,
 11
 Bürklüde Muştafâ, 62
 Buzurg Umid, see Kiyâ Buzurg-
 umid

Çübân, Amîr (Ilhânîd), 39 n. 8,
 64, 71

Dawwânt, Çalâl ad-Dîn, 84, 85
 Despina (wife of Uzûn Hasan),
 11, 12

Fađl Allâh Hürâft, 66, 84
 Falâb ibn Muhsin (Muâsa'sâ'), 70
 Farruh-yaşâr (Şirwân-shâh), 75,
 76, 80, 82
 Fâtima, 61 n. 8, 73
 Fayyûd (Muâsa'sâ'), 70
 Firdausî, 46 n. 2
 Fîrûz-shâh, "zarrîn-kulâh", 48,
 50-51

Ğahân-shâh (Qara-qoyunlu), 10,
 11, 56, 64-66, 78, 81
 Ğalâl ad-Dîn "Nau-Musalmân"
 (of Alamût), 60
 Ğalâl ad-Dîn Rûmî, see Rûmî
 Gâmi, Maulâna 'Abd ar-Râhî-
 mân, 53 n. 1, 84
 Gâzân Hân (Ilhânîd Sultân), 5,
 8, 15, 39, 40, 62
 Rîsim of, 22, 38
 Gibrâ'il, Amin ad-Dîn (ancestor
 of Şâfi Şâfi ad-Dîn), 51, 52
 Gingîz Hân, 8, 15, 22
 Gunaid, Şâfi (Safawîd), 51, 53,
 56, 63, 69, 71 ff., 84, 85
 Ardabîl Şâfi of, 43
 Death of, 75, 76
 Gâzî activities of, 52 ff.
 Marriage of, 74, 78
 Gûrgâni, as-Sayyid aš-Šarîf, 84
 Gûrlî Hasan (Sarbadâr), 67
 Guwainî, 'Atâ Malik (governor
 of Bagdâd and historian), 15,
 39
 Guwainî, Muhammed "Şâfi
 Dîvân", 15

Hâfiż (the poet), 37, 39

Haidar, Şâfi (Şâfawîd), 51, 53,
 63, 69, 72, 73, 78, 79, 84, 85
 Ardabîl Şâfi of, 43
 Death of, 77
 Gâzî activities of, 52, 75 ff.
 Marriage of, 78
 Hallâ, Şâfi (Sarbadâr), 67
 Hallî, Sultân (brother of Uzûn
 Hasan), 78 n. 2
 Hallî Sultân (Şirwân-shâh), 75
 Hallâg (the saint), 73
 Hasan, 2nd Imâm, 74
 Hasan, Sayyid (Muâsa'sâ'), 70
 Hasan, Uzûn, see Uzûn Hasan
 Hasan al-Bâsîrî, 53
 Hasan-i Buzurg (Galâyir), 64
 Hasan-i Kuçuk, Şâfi (Cübânîd),
 54 n. 2
 Hasan-i Şabbâh, 3, 4, 5, 15, 37
 n. 7
 Hasan-'Ali (Qara-qoyunlu), 65
 Hatâ'i (taħallus of Sâh Ismâ'îl),
 50
 Haz'al, Şâfi (of Hüzistân), 13
 al-Hilli, see Ibn al-Muṭâħħar
 Hudâbanda, see Olgaitû
 Hulâgû, 7, 8, 23, 27, 38 n. 3, 42,
 59
 Hungî, Fađl Allâh ibn Rûzbi-
 hân, 27, 31, 32 ff., 38
 Life of, 31 n. 1, 32
 Safawîd views on, 75 ff.
 Works of, 31
 Husain, 3rd Imâm, 61 n. 8, 64 n.
 2
 Husain Baiqarâ, Sultân (Tîmû-
 rid), 79, 84
 Hwâga 'Ali (şâfi of Ardabîl),
 43, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57,
 71, 79
 Death of, 54 n. 5
 Gazals of, 55 n. 4
 Hwâga Maulâna İsfahâni, see
 Hungî
 Hwâgu Kirmâni (the poet), 16

Ibn 'Alwân, Mubârak, 40
 Ibn Baṭṭûṭa (traveller)
 Views on Ismâ'îls of Syria,
 39
 Views on Nusairîs, 36
 Ibn-i Bazzâr, Tawakkul ibn Is-
 mâ'îl, 48
 Ibn Fahd al-Hilli, Ahmed, 3, 40,
 64, 66, 67 ff.
 Ibn Falâb, Muhammed (Muâsa'
 sâ'), 40, 73
 Activities in Quhistân, 68 n. 6
 Genealogy of, 68 n. 5

Ibn Haldūn (historian)
Views on *sufism*, 42 n. 3
Views on Timūr, 65

Ibn Hanbal, 49

Ibn Makkī al-Āmīlī, Muham-mad, 3, 8, 40, 66 ff.

Ibn al-Mu'tahhar al-Hilli, al-Hasan ibn Yūsuf, 3, 6, 23, 24, 27 ff., 30 ff., 33 n. 5, 34, 37, 40, 41, 59, 63, 64, 66, 71
Life of, 31 n. 1
Mobile school of, 29 n. 1
Works by, 28 n. 2

Ibn Qādī Samāwīnā, see Badr ad-Dīn

Ibn aṣ-Ṣā'iq, Ṣaiḥ Šams ad-Dīn
Muhammad ibn Abīmad, 55

Ibn Taimīya, Aḥmad, 23, 24, 27, 28–30, 33 n. 5, 38, 41, 59
Religious beliefs of, 36
Views on Nuṣairī sect, 34 ff.
Views on *sufism*, 42

Ibn-i Yamīn (the poet), 16

Ibrāhīm Sultān, Mīrzā (Timūrid prince) 57 n. 1

Ibrāhīm (Ṣaiḥ of Ardabīl), 43, 51, 52, 56, 71, 72, 79

Ibrāhīm (Safavīd, brother of Sāh Ismā'īl), 78, 80

Iğl, 'Aqd ad-Dīn, 23, 84

Ismā'īl, Sāh of Iran, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 9, 15, 23, 28, 32, 33, 34, 43, 47, 48, 50, 51, 55, 62, 66 n. 2, 67, 69, 70, 71 ff., 77, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85
Accession of (*füllü*), 1, 3, 82
Campaign against Muša'ba', 12
Capital city of, 24
Poetry of, 73

Ispand (Qara-qoyunlu), 64

Ivan III (Czar of Russia), 11

Jem, Prince (brother of Bāyezīd II), 78

Kalo-Joannes, ruler of Trape-zund, 11, 74

Kaiköbād III, see 'Alā' ad-Dīn

Kiyā Buzurg umid (of Alā-mūt), 37 n. 7

Lāhiḡī, Maulānā Šams ad-Dīn, 80

Mahtūm, Mir, 48

Mālik, 49

al-Mālik an-Nāṣir Muhammad ibn Qalawūn (Mamlūk Sultān), 36, 39

al-Mālik az-Zāhir Baibars (Mamlūk Sultān), 36

al-Ma'mūn ('Abbāsid Caliph), 3

Mehmed II (Ottoman Sultān), 8, 9, 11, 12, 63, 74, 77, 78, 79

Miqdād as-Suyūrī (*imāmi* school), 67 n. 3

Misallātī, Gamal ad-Dīn (Mālikī judge of Damascus), 7

Mu'āwiya (Umayyad Caliph), 30

Mu'ayyad, Sultān 'Alī (Sarba-dār), 67

Mubārak, Sultān (Muša'ba'), 71

Muhammad, the Prophet, 1, 3, 4, 32, 33, 34, 35, 39, 41, 43, 44, 48, 49, 50, 52, 53, 57, 61, 62, 64, 65, 66, 68, 70, 71, 80, 85

Muhammad (ancestor of Saiḥ Šaff ad-Dīn), 51

Muhammad ibn al-Hasan at-Tūṣī, "Ṣaiḥ at-Tā'iya", 27

Muhammads
"Three Early Muhammads": Kulaīnī, Ibn Bābawayh, Tūṣī, 71
"Three Later Muhammads": al-Hurr al-Āmīlī, Mullā Muhsin-i Faid, Muhammad Baqī Maṭlis, 71

Muhammānā ibn 'Isā, 14

Muhsin, Maulā or Sultān (Muša'ba'), 70

Muhtaşam, Nāṣir ad-Dīn (governor of Quhistān), 26

al-Muqtadir ('Abbāsid Caliph), 1

Mūsā al-Kāzīm, 7th Imām, 27, 51, 68, 78

Muša'ba', Sayyid Muhammad, 48

al-Mustansır (Fātimid Caliph), 2

Nādir Sāh (Afšār), 31

Naqshband, Bahā' ad-Dīn, 84

an-Nāṣir ('Abbāsid Caliph), 13, 27, 57 n. 3, 60 n. 2

an-Nāṣir (Mamlūk Sultān), see al-Mālik an-Nāṣir

Nawā'ī, Mir 'Alī Sir, 84

Nedim Aḥmed Efendi (Ottoman poet), 18 n. 3

Nūrbahās, Sayyid Muhammad, 40, 48, 68, 84

Orhān (Ottoman Sultān), 19, 77

Osmān (Ottoman Sultān), 14, 58, 59, 76, 77

Pīr Budāq (Qara-qoyunlu), 31, 65

Prophet, the, see Muhammad the Prophet

al-Qā'im ('Abbāsid Caliph), 2

Qānūn al-Gaurī (Mamlūk Sultān), 81

Qarā-Muhammad (Qara-qoyunlu), 10

Qarā-Osmān (Aq-qoyunlu), 11

Qarā-Yūsuf (Qara-qoyunlu), 9, 10, 11, 64

Qāsim-i Anwār, Amīr or Sāh, 48, 54, 84

Qutb ad-Dīn (ancestor of Saiḥ Šaff ad-Dīn), 51, 52

Rāfiḍ ad-Dīn Fadl Allāh (Mon-gol vizir), 8, 18, 39, 53

Riżā Sāh Pahlavī, 13

Rūb, Sāh (Timūrid), 9, 10, 56

Rukn ad-Dīn (Sarbadār), 67

Rūmī, Galāl ad-Dīn, 26, 59 ff., 61, 63

Rūmī, Ḥasan (historian), 2

aṣ-Ṣabbāḥ, Ḥasan, see Ḥasan-i Ṣabbāḥ

Sa'dī (the poet), 53

Sadr ad-Dīn, Ṣaiḥ of Ardabīl, 43, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54 ff., 56 n. 5, 71

Saff, Sāh of Iran, 27

Šaff ad-Dīn Ishāq, Ṣaiḥ of Arda-bīl, 11, 12, 16, 40, 43, 46 ff., 50, 51, 52 ff., 56, 57, 58, 71, 72, 73, 78, 79, 83, 84
"Alid descent of, 47 ff., 53 n. 5, 55 n. 4
Education of, 52
Genealogy of, 47, 51
Marriage of, 53
Sayyid-ship of, 46 ff..
Writings of, 49

Šaff ad-Dīn al-Hilli, Ibn Sarāyā (poet), 64

Sāh I, 49

Sāh Ismā'īl, see Ismā'īl, Sāh of Iran

Sāh Qull, 78 n. 4

Sāh Tahmāsb, see Tahmāsb, Sāh of Iran

Saibānī Hān, Muham-mad (Öz-bek), 32, 34

aṣ-Ṣa'īdī, Ḥwāga Čamāl ad-Dīn, 31

"Ṣaiḥ at-Tā'iya", see Muham-mad ibn al-Hasan at-Tūṣī

Šalāh (ancestor of Saiḥ Šaff ad-Dīn), 51

Šalāh ad-Dīn (Ayyūbid Sultān), 2

Salmān al-Fārisī, 70

Sams ad-Dīn (son of Saiḥ Zāhid-i Gīlānī), 53

Sams-i Tabrizī, 59, 60

Satan (faṣīḥ), 36

Sarī Saltuk, 59 n. 1, 60, 62

Sāwāqī, Salmān (poet), 16, 44

Selim (Ottoman Sultān), 9, 13, 15, 21, 34, 58, 60, 62, 63, 78

aṣ-Širāzī, Maḥmūd ibn Ibrāhīm, 7

Širāzī, Qutb ad-Dīn, 23

Suhrawardi, Abū Naṣīb, 53

Sulaimān, Sāh of Iran (Šafa-wid), 51

Sultān Sāh Haddād, Abī, 57 n. 2

Sūtārī, Qādī Nūr Allāh, 27, 28, 31 ff.

Tabarī, Muham-mad ibn Čarkī (the historian), 1

Tabrizī, Sayyid Čamāl ad-Dīn, 48

Taftazānī, Sa'd ad-Dīn, 84

Tahāwī, Abū Ca'far Aḥmad, 36 n. 4

Tahmāsb, Sāh of Iran, 2, 20 n. 3, 47, 48, 49, 50

Tā'l, Saiḥ 'Alī ibn Muham-mad, 68 n. 3

Timür, 8, 9, 10, 11, 20, 40, 54, 59, 62, 63
 Histories on, 16–17
 Policy of conquest, 9 u. 2
 Relations with Sarbadâr, 67 n. 6
 Relations with sūfis, 52, 53, 54, 55
 Relations with Turks, 58
 Religious views of, 64 ff.
 Torlak Hu-kemâl, 62
 Tugrul Bey (Great Seljuq), 2
 Tüsü, Naṣir ad-Din, 23, 24 ff., 28, 29, 30, 37, 41, 59
 Involvement with Ismâ'îlis, 23, 35
 Master of waqfs, 38
 Seventh centenary of, 24 n. 3, 27

Tomb and burial of, 27
 Views on sūfism, 42 n. 3
 'Ubayd-i Zâkânî (the poet), 16
 Ulgâtu, Muhammad Hudâbanda (Ilhâniid Sultân), 3, 5, 8, 14, 15, 16, 24, 28, 29, 30, 39, 40, 43, 49, 62
 Life of, 31 n. 1
 Mobile school of, 29 n. 1
 Religious disputations, 29 n. 1
 Religious views of, 32, 38
 Seal of, 32 n. 5
 Sî'ism of, 22, 23, 32–33, 63
 'Umar (Caliph), 29
 'Utmân (Caliph), 29
 Uwais, Galâyir Sultân, 53 n. 6

Uzûn Hasan (Aq-qoyunlu), 2, 10, 11, 12, 14, 23, 65, 70, 72, 74, 75, 79
 Death of, 12
 History of, 17
 Relations with Venice, 12
 Religious views of, 78
 Ya'qûb, Sultân (Aq-qoyunlu), 70, 72, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79
 Yâqût (geographer), 44–45
 Yasawî, Kâwâga Ahmed, 60, 61
 Yûnus Emrî, 60, 61, 62
 Zâhid-i Gilâni, Saîh, 48, 49, 50, 51, 53
 Zaid "â-Sâhid" (Zâidi Imâm), 4
 Zaitûn, Qâdi Naşr Allâh, 6
 Zâkânî, see 'Ubayd-i Zâkânî

2. PLACE NAMES

Acre, 14
 Adana, plain of, 13
 Ädärbaigân, 13, 23, 44, 45, 47, 50, 74
 Saîhs of Ardabil in, 12, 52–57, 58, 67, 71, 73, 83, 84
 Sûfis in, 57
 Under Mongols, 15, 43, 58
 Under Qara-qoyunlus, 10, 56, 65
 Aegean sea, 9
 Africa, 45
 'Ain Gâlût, 7
 Alamût, 2, 5, 7, 15, 23, 24, 26, 35, 37, 39, 40, 60, 84
 Aleppo, 14
 Amasya, 61
 Anatolia, 3, 5, 7, 14, 19, 42, 51, 78, 83
 Ardabil Order's influence in, 54, 56, 71, 74
 Dû l-Qadr in, 13
 Emergence of Turkman federations in, 10, 11, 14
 Mamlûk influence in, 58
 Ottoman control in, 8–9, 58, 76, 81
 Religious movements in, 57, 58–63, 66, 84
 Safawids in, 81
 Seljuqs in, 61
 Settlement in, 59
 Subdued by Mongols, 8, 58
 Timûrid control in, 9, 58
 Turkish emirates in, 8 n. 3, 9
 Turkomans in, 46, 59
 Äni, 52
 Ankara, 9, 11, 54, 58, 63
 Arabia, 7
 Arabistân, 70
 Ararat, 44, 65
 Araxes (Aras river), 45, 75

Ardabil, 11, 62, 83–85
 Geography of, 43 ff.
 Order of, 12, 40, 41 ff., 46
 Pilgrimage to, 57
 Safawids in, 81
 Armenia, 45
 Artuñenian S. S. R., 44
 Arrân, 45
 Arzingân, 81, 82
 Ashkabad (Turkmen Republic, U. S. S. R.), 4
 Asia Minor, see Anatolia
 Astarâbâd, 84
 Atlantic Ocean, 15
 Ayas (Mediterranean port), 43
 Azerbaijan S. S. R., 44
 Bâb al-Abwâb, see Darband
 Bagdâd, 2, 3, 5, 7, 12, 15, 23, 24, 26, 27, 28, 35, 38, 39, 52, 59, 64, 67, 68, 69
 Capital of Cûbânids, 9
 Declining importance of, 43
 Galâyirs in, 44, 59
 Mongol conquest of, 7, 13, 37, 59
 Muâsa'â's in, 70
 Seljuq rule in, 13
 al-Bâidâ, 24, 36
 Baihaq, see Sabzawâr
 Baku, 77, 82
 Balj, 59
 Balkans, 46
 Bam, 84
 Black Sea, 12
 Italian commerce in, 14
 Bosnia, 57
 Bursa, 62
 Cairo, 7 n. 3, 8, 16, 24, 36, 62
 Suppression of heretics in, 7 n. 3
 Çaldirân, 9, 15
 Caspian Sea, 44, 45, 80, 81

Caucasus, 44, 74
 Aq-qoyunlu contacts with, 11
 Gâzi activities in, 12, 75, 76
 Central Asia, 18, 22, 43
 Sî'îf activities in, 61
 China, 37, 43
 Constantinople, Ottoman conquest of, 11, 12
 Cyprus, Venetian arms in, 11, 12
 Dailamân, 81
 Damascus, 7, 8, 16, 24, 27, 28, 40, 59, 65, 67
 Suppression of heretics in, 7 n. 3
 Damâwand, 44
 Darband, 44, 45, 76
 Dawrîd, 14
 Diyar-bakr, 10, 78
 Aq-qoyunlu center, 11, 14
 Dizfûl, 55
 Dobrudja, 59
 Edirne, 62
 Egypt, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 10, 18, 35, 39, 40, 60, 81
 Ottomans in, 9, 13, 15, 58
 Elbistân, Dû l-Qadr in, 13
 Elburz, 44, 76, 77
 Euphrates, 14
 Europe
 Eastern, Ottoman threat to, 14
 Mysticism in, 57
 Western, 11
 Fârs, 9, 16, 69, 78
 Genoa, Commerce with Middle East, 14, 43
 Georgia, 56, 70, 73, 74
 Gilân, 16, 44, 51, 62, 79, 80
 Safawids in, 80, 81
 Sûfis in, 57

Hamā, 39
 Hawiza, see Huwaiza
 Herat, 8, 10, 17, 71, 79, 83
 Hīgāz, 15
 Hillā, 14, 28, 68
 Hamm, 30
 Hung, 31
 Hurāsān, 3, 13, 16, 18
 Aq-qoyunlu territory, 11
 Ardabil Order activity in, 54,
 71
 Sarbadārs in, 66, 67, 83
 Sī'ism in, 66
 Huwaiza, Muša'ṣa' dynasty in,
 12, 69, 70
 Hūzistān, 13, 16, 69, 70
 Ḫwāf, 56
 India
 Moguls in, 13, 83
 Trade with, 43
 Indian Ocean, 15
 Iran, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 12, 14, 19, 21,
 39, 43, 50, 51, 78, 83, 85
 Aq-qoyunlus in, 11, 59, 79
 Emergence of Turkman federations in, 10, 14
 Religion in, 22 ff., 28, 40, 67,
 79, 84
 Ruled by Mongol-Il-hāns, 8,
 14, 27, 59
 Ruled by post-Il-hānid successor states, 9, 59
 Ruled by Timur, 9, 17
 Sūfi orders in, 42, 57, 68, 71
 Trade in, 14
 Turkmāns in, 46
 Iraq, 3, 4, 5, 7, 13, 19, 39, 51, 64,
 78, 83, 84
 Decline in importance of, 43
 Muša'ṣa's in, 12, 40, 66, 83
 Qara-qoyunlus in, 10, 56
 Ruled by Čubānids and Galāyirs, 9
 Ruled by Mongol-Il-hāns, 8
 Ruled by Timurids, 9, 65
 Sī'ism in, 68, 69
 Trade in, 14
 Turkmāns in, 46
 Irāq-i 'Ağam, 24
 Ardabil Order's activity in,
 54
 İsfahān, 16, 31, 33, 42
 İsfarangān, 51
 İstahır, 78, 79
 Istanbul, 20, 78. See also Constantinople

Jerusalem, 54, 55, 62
 Karbalā, 39
 Kāsān (Qāsān), 31
 Kāsān, 16, 31
 Kirmān, 9, 16, 84
 Kūh-i Sabalān, 44
 Kura, 45
 Kurdistān, 70
 Lāhīgān, 80, 81
 Laristān, 31
 Luristān, 9, 70
 Maġrib, see Morocco
 Marāqa, 23, 39
 Mar'aš, Dū l-Qadr in, 13
 Mardin, 63
 Māwardī annahr (Transoxiana),
 3, 17, 18, 31, 33, 34, 52, 68, 74,
 84
 Timurids in, 65, 79
 Uzbeks in, 13, 83
 Māzandarān, 16
 Sūfis in, 57
 Mecca, 30, 33, 62
 Medina, 64, 71
 Mediterranean, Italian commerce in, 14, 43
 Morocco, 3
 Mosul, 15
 an-Naġaf, 64
 Naħġawān, 45, 82
 North Africa, 15
 Palestine, 54
 Persia, 4, 44. See also Iran
 Persian Gulf, 11, 12
 Qarāga-dāg, 73, 81
 Qāsān, 31
 Qazwin, 43, 46
 Qonya, 5, 58, 59, 60, 62
 Quhistān, 26, 68
 Qum, 16, 75
 Raḥba, 14
 Rayy, 15, 44
 Red Sea, 7, 15
 Rūm (Anatolia), 49, 58, 60, 61,
 73, 74, 81
 Rumeli, 62
 Sabzawār, 9, 66, 67
 Sām, 74, 81
 Samāḥī, 77
 Samarqand, 16
 Under Timurids, 9, 10
 Širāz, 23, 24, 31, 36, 70
 Širwān, 45, 76, 77, 78, 82
 Sīstān, 16
 Siwās, 11
 Seat of Mongol governors, 8,
 58
 Siyāh-kūh, see Qarāga-dāg
 Sultāniya, Ilhānid capital, 8, 24,
 43, 52
 Surūr, 1, 79, 82
 Syr Daryā, 9
 Syria, 4, 5, 7, 11, 23, 35, 41, 55,
 67, 74
 Ismā'īlis in, 39
 Mamīlūks in, 10
 Ottomans in, 9, 13, 15, 58
 Trade in, 14
 Tabaristān, 3, 16
 Tabriz, 1, 5, 8, 12, 23, 24, 36, 45,
 52, 59, 62, 69, 70, 76
 Importance under Mongols,
 43
 Safawids in, 72, 77, 78, 82
 Trade in, 43
 Under Galāyirs, 9, 10, 44, 59
 Tālib, 44, 49, 73, 80, 81
 Tarsus, 14
 Tārum, 81
 Taurus, 61
 Tehran, 44
 Tiflis, 45
 Transoxiana, see Māwardī an-nahr
 Trapezund, 14
 Aq-qoyunlu relations with, 11
 Byzantine enclave, 12
 Gazā against, 74
 Turkmen Republic, U. S. S. R.,
 4
 Van, Lake, 10, 14
 Venice
 Ambassadors accounts, 20
 Commerce with Middle East,
 14
 Relations with Aq-qoyunlus,
 11, 12
 Yaman, see Yemen
 Yazd, 9
 Yemen, 3
 Zagros, 76

3. WORDS, TITLES, THINGS

'Abbāsid, 'Abbāsids, 2, 3, 5, 8,
 13, 24, 44, 59
 Abdāl, 57
 'Abid, 68 n. 1
 Accession (*gulūs*), 1, 3, 82
 Agān, 57 i, 1, 41
 Administration, see Diwān, and
 Šahib Diwān
 Afāl, 34
 Afār (Turkmāns), 81
 Afyān (opium), 65 n. 5
 Āgā-bānīya, 2
 Agrarian system, in Āgarbāj-
 gān, 39 n. 1, 51
 Agwād, 49
 Ahī, 57
 Ahī Allāh, 72 n. 2
 Ahī al-bait, 70

WORDS, TITLES, THINGS

Ahl al-bid'a, 5
Ahl-i fuwwat, 57
Ahl al-haqq, 25
Ahl-i Haqq, 50, 66, 84
Ahl as-Sunna, 26, 49
Ahl as-Sunna wal-jam'a, 31, 49
Ahl-i ubuwwat, 57
al-A'imma al-Jād'āšar, 1, 6
'Ain Gälüt, battle of, 7
Al 'Alī, 7
Al Muzaflar, 9
Al-i Haidar, 72 n. 2
'Alawī/Alevi, 54 n. 5, 61 n. 4
All (taħallus of ḥwāġa 'All), 55 n. 4
'All-İlahism, 70
'Alid, 'Alids, 3, 46, 47, 48, 53, 55, 64 n. 2
Amīr, Amīrs, 9, 39 n. 8
Amirate, 8
al-Āmma (the Sunnis), 1
al-Āmma (the common people), 8
Anatolian, 61, 81
Ankara, battle of, 9, 11, 54, 58, 63
Aq-qoyunlu, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 17, 28, 43, 53, 59, 65, 66, 70, 72, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83
Arab, Arabs, 68, 69, 71, 80
Ascendancy of, 13, 44
Historians, 15, 16, 18, 20, 52
Poets, 64
Scholars, modern, 20
Arabic, 24
Language, 13
Manuscripts, 17
Armenian, Armenians, 11, 43, 44, 45, 65, 76
Artuqid dynasty, 63
Aṣ'arī, *Aṣ'arīt*, *Aṣ'ariya*, 33, 38, 49
Asnad, 49
Asnād, see *Muṣtiyānē*
Assassins, 2, 5, 39, 40
Astronomical studies, 23, 39
Atābeks, 9
Authors, *īnd'āšarī*, 1; *sunni*, 52
A'yān as-ṣī'a, 64
Ayyūbids, 2
al-Azhar, 37
Bābā'la, 57, 60, 61, 62
al-Bābīya, 2
al-Bahā'ya, 2
Bahtiyārī (tribe), 70 n. 6
Bairamyā, 84
Bārānī, Sultān Husain (Qara-qoyunlu), 81
Barbary corsairs, 15
Bājīn, 37 n. 3, 72 n. 2
Bājīnī, 26, 35, 61
Bājīnīya, 29
Bay'a (allegiance), 34
Bāyandarīya (Aq-qoyunlus), 81
Bektaşī, Bektaşīsm, Bektaşīya, 57, 61, 84
Doctrines of, 62
Beylik, *beyliks*, 8, 9, 58, 83
Bid'a, 32

Biographical sources, 15 n. 3, 17, 20 n. 4
Bitkiliyān, 53 n. 6
Boundaries, 5, 13–14, 70
Brethren of Purity, see *Ihwān as-Ṣafā*
Buwaibids, 3
Byzantine, 11, 12, 74
Čagatāy, 18, 50
Čaldirān, battle of, 9, 15
Caliph, caliphal, caliphs, 2, 13, 35, 52, 64 n. 5, 66
Caliphate, 3, 13, 26, 29, 38, 59
Capital, capitals, 24, 43, 44, 58
Čerkes, 11, 74, 75, 76, 82; see also Georgians
Chancery correspondence, see *Muṣtiyānē*
Cherkes, see Čerkes
Christian, Christianity, Christians, 12, 22, 29, 35, 43, 44, 45, 62, 63, 65, 73, 74, 84; see also "Infidels"
Cities: Sultāniya, 43 n. 3; Tabriz, 43–44
Classes: social, 42 n. 3; peasant, 61 n. 4
Coinage, see Numismatics
Commerce, 14, 43 n. 2
Comnenae (of Trapezund), 11, 12
Correspondence, official, 23 n. 1, 39 n. 4, 53 n. 5, 81
Crusades, 14, 35
Čubānids, 9, 40, 52, 54, 59, 63
Dabir, *dabirān*, 61 n. 2
Dār al-harb, 45, 46, 74
Dār al-İslām, 45, 73, 74, 84
ad-Darrdb (Mamlūk official), 7
Darwīš, *dardarwīš*, *darwīshīm*, 39, 42, 57 n. 3, 58 n. 1, 61, 67, 76, 79; see also *Sūfi*
Dastār, 79 n. 5
Da'wa (İsmā'īl/Fātimid), 2, 5, 39 n. 8, 60
Dervish, see *Darwīš*
Dialects: of Tabriz, 44; Ağdır, 44 n. 3, 47, 50, Gilākī, 52 n. 3
Diaries, 20
Dihqān, -s, 51
Dīr, 55
Diplomacy, 14
Dīwān (poetry), 53, 61 n. 8, 75
Dīwān (administration), 61 n. 2; see also "Sāhib Dīwān"
Dū l-Qadr (Turkmāns), 13, 14, 81
Dūdmān, 50, 51, 78, 79, 80 n. 4
Duodeciman, see *īnd'āšarī*
ad-Duruz, 2, 5
Düst, 55 n. 1
Egyptians (historians), 18, 69 n. 4, 81 n. 11
Europeans, 14
Trade with East, 43 n. 2
Travellers, 19
See also West
Faqīh, 68
Faqīr (fugārī), 42 n. 3
Faqīr-bāšī/faqīra-bāšī, 56 n. 1
Fārd hisāya (collective obligation), 46
Fatā, 57
Fātimid, -s, 2, 3, 4, 5, 35, 39, 40
Fatūd, 33 n. 1, 42 n. 3
Feudalism, 14, 51
Fiddīs (*fiddīs*), 3, 39, 40
Fiqh, 24, 67
Firmāns, 19, 48 n. 5, 53 n. 6
al-Firqa an-nādiya, 32 n. 3
Fitna, 33 n. 1
Fityān, 57
Folk Islam, 22, 40, 42, 51, 56, 57, 68, 71, 83, 84
In Anatolia, 58 ff., 61 n. 2
Frankish, 61
French writers, 21
Frontiers, 14, 44, 45, 76
Furū', 25, 33
Futuwwa, 84
Gā'farī, *Gā'farīya*, 1, 6, 48
Gāiba, 27
Gālī al-āṣrāf, 48 n. 5
Galāyir, -s, 3, 9, 10, 16, 40, 44, 52, 53, 59, 63, 64, 65
Gazal, 55 n. 4, 60, 61
Gazā, *gazī*, *gazīs*, *gazīyān*, *gazīt*, 46, 52, 54, 56, 59, 63, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 79, 82, 84
Genoese, 43
Geography: of Ardabil, 43 ff.; geographical sources, 16, 21 n. 3
geographical works, 46 n. 2;
Georgian, -s, 11, 12, 43, 45, 52, 54, 74, 76, 77; see also Čerkes
German writers, 21
Germiān (beylik), 14
Għali, 4; see also *Għalib*
Għuluww, 4; see also *Għalib*
Għid, 46, 75
Golden Horde, 11, 43
Governors: Mongol, 8, 23, 53, 58; Walls of Hūzistān (Muħaġa's), 70
Għalib, 2, 3, 4, 5, 40, 56, 65, 66, 71, 73, 77, 83
In Anatolia, 61, 62
Muħaġa's, 67 ff., 71
Nuṣairis, 23, 38
Sarbadars, 66 ff., 71
Yazīdīs, 55
Għimn, 7
Għilis (accession), 1, 3, 82
Għuluww, 29; see also *Għalib*
Għażiż-i-Şafija, 74
Hadīt, 29, 30, 49, 85; *hadīt humm*, 30 n. 3
Hāfiż (of Qurān), 52 n. 1
Haidaris, 57
Halifas, *ħulafà*, 54, 55, 73, 74
Halwas, 65 n. 5
Hanafī, -s, 32, 36, 39, 55
Handball, 8, 38
Hāndaqh, 57 n. 3
"Haqlaq" (*taħallus* of ġħaż-żeppa), 66
Harürīya (sect), 80 n. 10

al-Hāssa (i. e. the *Si'a*; ant. *al-‘Āmma*), 1
“*Hatā’ī*” (*tāħallūs* of *Šah Ismā’īlī*), 50
Hātīma, 47, 51
Hawdīg/bārīqītēs, 29
Heresy, heretical, 62, 64, 65, 67, 70, 71, 73, 80 n. 10
Heterodox, heterodoxy, 67, 71
High Islam, 22, 41, 59, 83, 84; High *Si'ism*, 64, 66, 71
Hilāfa, 33
Hikāyat, 49
Historians (Arab, Muslim, Persian), 15
Historical sources
Biographies, 17
Discussion of, 15 ff., 52
Local histories, 16 n. 4
Munṣiyād, 18–19
Safawid, 1, 17 n. 6
Tazkīrah, 17–18
Hukkām, 53 n. 6
Hurūf, 77, 79
Hurūfi, *hurūfiya*, 2, 57, 61, 66, 84
Hujbā, 30 n. 6
Huwaizī, 69 n. 1
Ibādat, 73
Ibādī, 28
Ibīdā, 72
Idrāk (reason), 30, 33
Iğāza, 49
Iğmā', 25, 29, 34
Iğħidd, 75
Iħwān, 57
Iħwān as-Safā, 25, 35
Ilāhi (hymns in praise of God), 61
Ilħadd, 1, 31
Ilħām, 53 n. 1
Ilħānid, *Ilħānid*, *Ilħāns*, 3, 7, 8, 9, 16, 27, 29, 37, 39, 40, 41, 46, 52, 53, 54, 56, 59, 62, 64, 71, 83
Capital of, 43
Historical works of, 16 n. 2
Si'ism of, 22, 63, 66
Succession dynasties, 51
Waqfs during, 38 n. 3
Imāma, 24, 25, 29, 31 n. 1, 33, 34, 37, 41
Imāmate, 3, 24, 25, 27, 33, 34, 57
Imāmi, -s, 4, 5, 27, 29, 32, 33, 34, 35, 63, 64, 66, 68, 71
Biographical works on, 18 n. 1
Imāmi *īqāh*, 28 n. 2, 67
Imāmiya, 1, 5, 6, 7, 30 n. 2, 33
Imāms (Twelve), 1, 24, 25, 27, 30, 32, 33, 34, 57, 70, 73, 78, 82 n. 1, 85
Appointment of, 25, 26, 41, 62
‘Isma, 25
First Imām, see ‘Ali ibn Abī Tālib (in Index 1).
Second Imām (Hasan), 64 n. 2
Third Imām (Husain), 61 n. 8
Sixth Imām (Ga'far as-Ṣādiq), 62

Seventh Imām (*Mūsā al-Kāzim*), 27, 51, 68
Eighth Imām ('Ali ar-Ridā), 3, 50
Twelfth Imām, 27
Sunni *imāms*, 30, 35, 37, 49
See also *al-A'imma al-ītnā-‘asar*
Imān, 29
Indian, 18
“Infidels”, 11, 26, 45, 75
Ingū dynasty, 9
İqāt, 14, 51
Iranian, -s, 21, 26, 54, 60, 80; see also Persian
Irādā, 57 n. 3, 70
Irādā, 72 n. 2
Islam, 1, 2, 3, 4, 22, 25, 26, 29, 31, 35, 42, 46, 57, 59, 63, 66, 76, 85
Dar al-Islām, 45, 46, 73, 74, 84
“Folk Islam”, 22, 42, 83, 84
“High Islam”, 22, 41, 59, 83, 84
Islamic, 3, 25, 37, 44, 53, 59, 64, 83
‘Ismā (infallibility), 25, 30, 33
Ismā’īlī, *Ismā’īlīs*, 2, 3, 5, 7, 15, 23, 25, 26, 29, 35, 37 n. 7, 39, 40, 60, 68, 71, 72, 84
Ismā’īlīya, 4, 5, 7, 39, 68
Istiħħra, 82 n. 1
Istiħħajja, 49
Italian, 14
Itnā’ābari, *Itnā’ābaris*, 1, 2, 3, 6, 8, 22, 23, 25, 26, 27, 29, 32, 34, 35, 37, 38, 39, 40, 43, 51, 54, 56, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 71, 80, 83; see also *Imāmi*, *Ga'farī*
Itnā’ābariya, *Itnā’ābarism*, 4, 6, 26, 32, 40, 63, 64, 67
‘Ibra (Prophet's family), 30
Jacobites, 43
Jewish, Jews, 22, 29, 35
Kāfir, *ħaġfirān*, *kuffār*, 29, 45 n. 2, 75
Kaldīm, 24, 37
Kardmīl, 48, 53, 54 n. 5
Kart dynasty, see Kurt
Kašīya, 2
Kutābdār, 56 n. 1
Kitāb-ħāna-yi Milli (Tehran), 2
Kitāb-ħāna-yi Salṭanati (Tehran), 50
Kufr, 35
Kunya, 51
Kurd, Kurdi, 39, 48, 51 n. 1, 81
Kurt dynasty, 9, 71
Laqab, 48
Latin, 43
Ma'būd, 73
Madhab, *madħabb*, 49
Mahdi, 27, 29, 36, 39, 68, 71, 73, 83
Mahdiyya, 27, 29, 66
Malikīda (*Ismā’īlī/Assassins*), 35, 62 n. 4
al-Malikī, 7
Mamlūks, 3, 7, 9, 10, 11, 13, 18, 24, 39, 40, 41, 54, 62, 67, 81, 83
Correspondence with Mongols, 39 n. 4
Frontiers of, 14
Historians, 18 n. 6
Role in Anatolia, 58
Mandqib, 50, 54 n. 5
Manuscripts, 16, 24, 27, 39, 50
Anon. History of *Šah Ismā’īlī*, 54 n. 4
Bibl. nationale, Paris, 19 n. 2
Malik Library, Tehran, 22, 38 n. 2
Milli Library Tehran, 2
Munaggimbāsi's *Għażiex ad-duwaw*, 18 n. 3
Persian bibliography of, 1
Safwat as-safā, 47 n. 3, 48 n. 7
Tahmilat al-abbār, 5
at-Tarbi al-Għajnejji, 17 n. 5, 20 n. 4, 37, 69
Timgr und Hoggħ ‘AII, 55 n. 1
Maqādmīl, 48, 75
Ma'refa, 70
Marriages, royal, 11–12, 74, 78
Massacres, *fi'l-sunni*, 41, 42 n. 2, 60
Masġūd, 73
Ma'sum, 33
Matħwila, 1
Maħnawi, 59, 60 n. 3
Maula, 57
Mevlevi (*darwiż* order), 59, 61
Middle Ages, 23, 45
Mihr-i ‘Ali, 52 n. 3
Milli Library (Tehran), see *Kitāb-ħāna-yi Milli*
Mir (*amīr*), 48
Missionary activity, 45
Mongol, Mongols, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 12, 13, 15, 16, 20, 21, 23, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 49, 52, 53, 54, 57, 58, 59, 62, 63, 64, 74, 77, 83, 84
Administration, 15 n. 4, 53 n. 6
Capital, 24, 43
Correspondence with Mamlūks, 39 n. 4
Diplomacy, 14
Historians, 15–16
Occupation of Bagdād, 13, 35
Religion of, 22 ff., 29 n. 1, 38, 41 ff.
Mongolica, 52
Mosque (of Ardabil), 54
Mu'afīla, 49
Mugħabs (of India), 13, 83
Mu'għid, 53 n. 1
Mugħtabihs, 21, 68 n. 1
Muħħabat (correspondence), see *Munṣiyād*
Mullās, 21
Munṣā, see *Munṣiyād*
Munṣiyād (official correspondence), 18–19

WORDS, TITLES, THINGS

Muqaddima, 47
Murād = *Murṣid*, 57 n. 3
Murid, *muridān*, *murids*, 46, 48, 49, 50, 53 n. 6, 55 n. 1, 57 n. 3, 71, 74, 75, 81
Murṣid, 48 n. 5, 51 n. 1, 75
Murīd, 68 n. 1
Murtaḍā ə’zām, 48 n. 5
Mušabbīha, 49
Muša’šā’, *Muša’šā’iyān*, 3, 40, 48, 55, 66, 67 ff., 73, 83
Doctrines of, 69 n. 5
Dynasty, 12
Governors, 12–13
Muslim, Muslims, 3, 4, 5, 8, 9, 11, 13, 14, 15, 22, 23, 25, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 35, 36, 37, 39, 40, 41, 43, 44, 45, 49, 52, 57, 59, 62, 63, 72, 74, 77, 83, 84
Travellers, 19 n. 4, 32 n. 5
Mušrihūn, 35
Mustaufī (superintendent of finances), 16, 46
Muštaqān (*Sūfi murids*), 53
Mulaqqarījān, 53 n. 6
Mulaqqawīja, 57 n. 3
Mu’tazila, 30, 49
Mysticism, 22; see also *Šūfism*
Nabi (*anbiyā’*), 42 n. 3
Nā’ib as-Sāfiyah (Mamlūk official in Damascus), 7
Nāma-hā-yi tārīhi, see *Munsiyā-yān*
Namāz, 73
Naqib al-aṣrāf, 8, 39; Cf. “*Gālāl al-aṣrāf*”, 48 n. 5
Naqshbandīs, 21 n. 5, 84
Nass-i wasiyat, 79 n. 5
Nasaf, 33
Nestorian, 22, 43
Nisfq, 29
Nīmat Allāh *Şāh* Wall, 84
Nisba, 24, 51 n. 1
Nubuwā, 25, 33, 53 n. 1
Numismatics, 32 n. 5, 64, 66
Nūrbahīya, 40, 68, 84
Nuṣairī, *Nuṣairīs*, 5, 23, 26, 29, 34 ff., 38, 40
Beliefs of, 35, 36
Nuswāb, 53 n. 6
Observatory, 23
Orders, *Sūfi*, 3, 42, 56, 63
Of Ardashīl, 41 ff., 43, 45, 46, 47, 49, 51, 53, 56, 57
Bektaşī, 61, 62
Gāzī activity of, 46, 52
Mevlevī, 59
Naqshbandī, 21 n. 5
Nūrbahīya, 40, 68
Qalandariya, 42 n. 3, 57
See also *Sūfi*, *Tarīqa*
Orthodox, orthodoxy, 30, 39, 41, 63
Ṣī’ī, 3, 21
Sunnī, 4, 7, 23, 25, 32, 59, 60, 61, 63, 64, 65, 78
Ottoman, Ottomans, 5, 8, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 20, 50, 57, 60, 62, 63, 70, 74, 78, 81, 82, 83

Gāris, 46, 76 ff.
Historians, 18
Poetry of, 21, 34
Outremer, 14

Pahlavi (dynasty), 13
Persian, -s, 13, 24, 43, 44, 48, 50, 80
Historians, 15–16, 17, 37
Index of Authors, 20
Journals: *Yadigār*, 20, *Ayan-*
da, 47 n. 1
Language, 13, 47
Poetry, 34 n. 4, 66
Scholars, modern, 20, 47
Poetry, poems, poets, 16, 18 n. 3, 21, 32, 33 n. 5, 34 n. 4, 37, 44 n. 1, 48, 49, 50, 52, 53, 55 n. 4, 56 n. 1, 59, 60, 61, 64, 65, 66, 68, 73, 75
Polemics (*ḥāfi* and *sunnī*), 23, 28, 29, 30 n. 5, 31 n. 1, 34 ff.
Portuguese, 15
Provinces:
Ādarbaigān, 43, 44

Qadariya, 49
Qādī al-quḍāt, 7
Qādī, qādīs, 34 n. 4, 36 n. 6, 50, 55
Qāqār (Turkmāns), 81
Qalandariya (*Sūfis*), 42 n. 3, 57
Qarāğā-dāğ, *Sūfis* of, 81
Qarāḥitāy (of Kirmān), 9
Qaramān (beylik), 14
Qara-qoyunu, 3, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 17, 43, 44, 53, 56, 59, 63, 65, 66, 68, 69, 78, 81, 83
Qarmatiāns, *Qarāmitā*, 35
Qibla, 73
Qidam al-aḡsām, 26
Qīfā (poem), 55 n. 4
Qızılıbāş, 1, 57, 63, 74
Qubba, 55, 68
Qur’ān, *Qur’ānic*, 23, 29, 34, 36, 37, 38, 41, 80
Sūrat Yūsuf, 37 n. 2
Sūrat Āl ‘Imrān, 37 n. 5

Rāṣid, 1, 8, 66
Rāṣida, 1, 80 n. 10
Rāṣidi, *Rawāṣid*, 7, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 43, 65
Rāh-i hiddayīt, 55
Rakabdārīya (Mamlūk military units), 7

Religion
Ibn Taimiya’s views on, 36
Of Mongols, 22 ff., 38
Polemics, 23, 28
Religious movements in Anatolia, 57, 58, 63
Shamanist, 22
Ṣī’ī uṣūl, 24 ff.

Revolts
In Anatolia, 66, 78 n. 4
Bābā’īs, 61
Saiḥ Badr ad-Dīn, 60, 62

Rubā’ī (poem), 52 n. 3, 55 n. 4,

75

Rūm Selgūqs, 8, 58, 59, 60, 61, 63
Rūmlū (Turkmāns), 81
Russian, -s, 11, 21 n. 6, 44, 61 n. 4
Ru’ya, 30 n. 7

Sabī (literary style), 19
Sab’īya, sab’īyūn (Seveners), 4, 26; see also *Ismā’īllis*

Şafawid, *Şafawids*, *Safawīya*, 4, 5, 6, 7, 10, 12, 13, 14, 15, 17, 18, 21, 27, 31, 32, 33, 40, 43, 45, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 53, 55 n. 4, 62, 63, 69, 70, 72, 74, 75, 77, 78, 79, 81, 83, 84, 85
Chronicles, 1, 17 n. 6
Compared to Ottomans, 76 ff.
Düdmān (family), 50, 51, 78, 79, 80
Gāzī activity of, 73 ff.
Library of (*hizāna-yi kutub*), 50
Movement, 43, 51, 71 ff.
Order of Ardashīl, 41 ff., 43, 45, 51
Propaganda of, 66
Succession of, 79 n. 5
Travellers, 50

Şāfi’ī (*madhab*), 22, 23, 29 n. 4, 32, 35, 36, 39, 46, 47
Sagī (literary device), 25
Şāh, *Şāhs*, 47, 48, 50
Şāhib dawq (*Sūfi*), 68 n. 1
Şāhib Diwān, 15
Şāhib hal (*Sūfi*), 68 n. 1
Şāh-nāma, 22, 46 n. 2
Şāih, Şāħe, Şuyūħ, mašayīħ, 35, 48, 72, 76
Of Ardashīl, 12, 43, 56
Şāfi, 14, 42 n. 3, 45, 53, 56, 57 n. 3, 61 n. 2, 71, 75, 84
Sālik (*Sāfi*), 72 n. 2
Sāfiyat-i suwāri/mā’nawī, 72 n. 2, 74, 75
Sāmiā (*Turkmāns*), 81
Sārdān-i sīpāh, 82 n. 1
Sarbadārī, 3, 9, 40, 63, 66 ff., 83
Sardārīn, 82
Sārī’ā, 49, 61, 62
Sarīj, 48 n. 2, 54 n. 5
Sāsānid, 44
Sayyid, sayyids, siyādat, 39, 46, 47, 48, 50, 51 n. 1, 53 n. 6, 70, 71 n. 1, 78 n. 2, 84

Scholars
Ādarbaigān, 50
İnd-āśārī, 3; *Sunnī*, 41; of

Seals, official, see Numismatics

Sects
Nuṣairī, 5, 23, 26, 29, 34 ff.
Qarmatiāns, 35
Sectarianism, 7, 55
Selgūqs (Great), 2, 13, 41
Rūm-Selgūqs, 8, 58, 59, 60, 61, 63
Seveners (*Ismā’īllis*), 3, 23, 26, 37; see also *Sab’īya*

Shamanist, 22
Şī’ah, see *Şī’ā*
Şī’ism, see *Şī’ism*
Şī’ite, see *Şī’ī*

as-Sī'a, 1, 4, 5, 7, 26, 30, 55 n. 4, 70, 71, 80 n. 10
Si'i 'All, 3
Sīfi, 33
Şī'i, *Şī'is*, 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 13, 14, 15, 21, 22, 23, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 37, 39, 40, 41, 46, 48, 49, 51, 55, 58, 59, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 71, 75 n. 3, 78, 80, 83
 Activity in Central Asia, 61 n. 1
 Biographical works, 18 n. 1
 Extreme *Şī'i*s, see *Gulāt*
 "Four Books" of, 27 n. 2
 Holy places, shrines, 24, 30, 39
 Minorities, 4
 Movements, 2
 Revolts, 42, 60, 62
Şī'i-sunnī massacres, 41
Uṣūl, 24 ff.
Şī'ism, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 15, 18, 21, 23, 27, 28, 31, 32, 38, 40, 43, 47, 48, 51, 56, 57, 61, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 71, 83, 84
 Contemporary views on, 5
 Extremist, see *Gulāt*
 Types of, 4 n. 3
 Under Mongols, 22
Sīsīla (*sūfī*), 53, 57
Sīra, 49
Sīrwanī-Şāhs, 45, 75, 76, 79, 80, 82
as-Sīrwanī, Saih Ibrāhim, 45 n. 3
Siyydat-i suwāri, 72 n. 2
 Social organizations
 Classes, 42 n. 3
 Nomads, 46, 59
 See also tribes
 Soyurgāl, 19, 53 n. 6
 Spanish, 15
 Succession, 79 n. 5
as-Sūdān (Mamlūk military units), 7
Sūfī, *Sūfis*, 3, 13, 22, 40, 42, 45, 50, 51, 53, 55, 56
 Bairamīya, 84
 Bektaşıya, 57, 61, 62, 84
 'Ilm of, 42 n. 3
 Mevlevi, 59, 61
 Naqābandis, 21 n. 5, 84
 Nürbahāya, 40, 68, 84
 Order of Ardabil, 41 ff., 43
 Practices, 42
 Qalandariya, 42 n. 3
 Sūfi poets, 60
 Sūfis of Rūm and Sām, 81
 Sūfi *Şāfijs*, 14, 42 n. 3, 35, 48, 54, 61 n. 2, 71
 Sūfi *sīsilas*, 53, 57, 58 n. 1
 Sūfi terms, 49 n. 4
 Sūfis among Turks, 61 n. 2
 Thought of, 59
 Writings of, 17
Sūfi Order of Ardabil, 58, 59, 62, 71, 72, 73, 74, 77, 78, 80, 83, 84
 Female members of, 56 n. 1
 Propaganda of, 63, 66; Turkman supporters of, 81

Sūfism, 40, 42, 51, 57, 59, 60, 61 n. 2, 73, 83
Sūfiyān-i Rūmlü, 54 n. 4
Sulgur (Atābek), 9
Sūfīân, *sūfīâns*, *salâfiân*, 2, 3, 9, 13, 38, 39, 40, 43, 44, 52, 72, 78, 81
 Sultanate, 64, 72 n. 2
Sūfîân al-'îtra, 48 n. 5
Sunna, 4, 26, 30, 32, 36, 61
Sunnî, *Sunnis*, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 14, 25, 28, 30, 32, 33, 34, 35, 38, 40, 47, 59, 60, 61, 64, 67, 71, 83, 84
 Authors, 23 n. 4, 28, 31, 34, 52, 72
 Beliefs of, 36 n. 4
 Sunnî orthodoxy, 7, 23, 63, 65, 78
 Poets, 60
 Reaction to Safawids, 18
Sunnî-Şī'i massacres, 41
Sunnism, 31, 38 n. 2, 63, 84
Surûr, battle of, 1, 79, 82
Tafsîr, 37
Tâg, 79 n. 5
Tâg-i Haidari, 78, 80
Tâgî (frontier post), 45 n. 2
Tâbilus (poetic name), 50, 55 n. 4, 66
Tâhirî, 19
Tâlibân (Sūfi adepts), 53, 55 n. 4
Tâlqîn, 49
Tamâyûl, 38 n. 2
Taqîya, 29, 42, 67 n. 3
Tarîh-nîwîsî (historiography), 22
Tarîqa, 48, 53, 68, 70, 84; see also, "Orders, Sūfi"
Tasawwuf, 22, 26, 42, 57, 83; see also Sūfi
Tâshayyu', see *Şī'ism*
Tatars (Mongols), 15, 21, 35, 44 n. 7, 45, 56 n. 3
Tauba, 49 n. 4, 53 n. 4
Tâuhibî, 25
Tâ'wilîl-i bâtil, 37 n. 7
Tekellâ (Turkmâns), 81
Teskherâs (biographical works), 17-18, 50, 66
Timûrid, -s, 9, 10, 11, 12, 16, 43, 52, 56, 57, 69, 74, 79, 83
 Historians, 17, 21
 Travellers, 19 n. 4
 Titles (royal, *Şī'i*, *sūfi*, etc.):
 Abû al-Gâzî Sultân (Haidar, Sâh Ismâ'îl's father), 72 n. 2
 Amîr al-mu'mînin ('All ibn Abî Tâlib), 57 n. 3
 al-'Allâma Ayat Allâh (Ibn al-Mu'tahhar al-Hillî), 27, 31
 Bâbâ (Bâbâ İshâq, Barâq Bâbâ), 60
 Fatâ ('All ibn Abî Tâlib), 57
 Fâtih (Mehmed II), 8
 Gâhân-guşâ (Gingîz Hân), 8
 Hâns (Mongol sultâns), 22
 Hâqân Iskandar-hân (Sâh Ismâ'îl), 82 n. 1
 Hâqân-i Kabîr (Sâh Ismâ'îl), 5
Hazrat-i 'All, or **Hazrat-i Murtażâ** ('All ibn Abî Tâlib), 52 n. 3, 57, 66 n. 2, 78 n. 2, 85
Hudâbânda (Ülgâitû), 3, 5, 28 n. 2, 32, 33
Maulâ ('All ibn Abî Tâlib), 57
Maulâna (Gâlâl ad-Dîn Rûmî), 59
al-Muhaqqiq (Nâsîr ad-Dîn Tûsî), 27
al-Muhaqqiq al-Awwâl (Gâfar ibn al-Hasan al-Hillî), 27 n. 5, 28 n. 2
Muqaddam (Ismâ'îl leader), 40
Mušâ'âsa (Sayyid Muhammed ibn Falâh), 48
Nau-Musalmân (Gâlâl ad-Dîn of Alâmût), 60
Pâdişâh (Gâzân Hân), 38 n. 2
Pâdişâh (Sultân 'All, elder brother of Sâh Ismâ'îl), 79
al-Qâ'ân or **al-Qâ'n** (Mongol Sultân Abû Sa'id), 56
Sâh (Sûfi leader), 48
Sâh Efendi (Saih Ibrâhim of Ardabil), 56 n. 1
as-Sâhid al-Awwâl al-'Allâma at-Tâni (Ibn Makki al-'Amîlî), 8, 27 n. 5, 40, 66
as-Sâhid at-Tâni (Zain ad-Dîn al-'Amîlî), 67 n. 3
Saihâ (Heads of Ardabil Sûfi order), 12, 53 n. 6
Sayh-i Sâh (Saih Ibrâhim of Ardabil), 56 n. 1
Sâh Gâhân-ârâ (Sâh Ismâ'îl), 5
Saih at-Tâ'ifa (Muğ. ibn al-Hasan at-Tûsî), 27, 71
as-Saihân (the caliphs Abû Bakr and 'Umar), 7
Sayyid 'All 'Agâm (Hwâga 'All), 55
Sulaimân-şân (Sâh Ismâ'îl), 81
Sultân-şâh (Sâh Ismâ'îl), 5
 Three Early Muhammads (Kulâînî, Ibn Bâbawayh, and Muhammed ibn al-Hasan at-Tûsî), 71
 Three Later Muhammads (al-Hurr al-'Amîlî, Mullâ Muhsin-i Fâid, and Muğ. Bâqîr Maglisî), 71
Uzûn Hasan or **Hasan at-Ta'wîl** (Uzûn Hasan Aq-qoyulu), 2
Zarrîn-kulâh (Flîrûz Sâh of Ardabil), 48, 50, 51
 Trade routes, 14, 43
Trapezund, empire of, 11, 12, 14
Trapezantine dynasty, see *Comnenae*
 Travel literature, 19 n. 4
 Travellers: Marco Polo, 43 ff., 45 n. 5; Schiltberger, 44; Chardin, 50
Treaties: Mongol-Mamlûk, 39 n. 8

Tribes:
 Bahtiyārī, 70 n. 6
 Mongol, 22
 Turco-Mongolian, 59, 63
 Turkish, 58
 Turkmān, 46, 49, 74, 81
 Turkān (Turks/Turkmāns), 61 n. 2
 Turkish, Turks, 2, 8, 12, 13, 48, 50, 58, 63, 74, 77
 Language, 13; Dialect, 47;
 Beyliks, 14; Oğuz Turks, 50;
 Eastern Turks, 59; Historians, 18; Scholars, modern, 20, 48, 61; Çagatay, 18;
 Poetry, 34 n. 4, 48, 50, 66 n. 2; Movements of, 59 n. 1
 Turkmān, Turkmāns, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 46, 49, 71, 74, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83
 Federations, 10
 Frontiers, 14
 Historians, 17, 21
 Sī'ism of, 58 n. 1, 61 n. 2, 66
 Tribes, 81
 Twelfth Imām, 27

Twelvers (*Iftād-āṣārīs*), 3, 21, 23, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 32, 35, 71, 79
 'Ulamā, 14, 23, 29 n. 1, 34, 42, 78
 Government subsidies to, 23
 Orthodox 'ulamā, 61 n. 2
 Sunnī 'ulamā, 33 n. 1
 Ulūhiyat, 73
 al-'Ulūm al-ġarība (magic?), 68
 Umarī, 82
 Umayyads, 30
 Umma, 25
 'Urafa, 57 n. 3
 al-Urdū, 29 n. 1
 'Urf, 25
 Ustı̄glü (Turkmāns), 81
 Uṣul (fit̄/sunna), 24 ff., 33
 Uzbeks, 13, 31, 32, 34, 79, 83
 Venetian, -s: Envoys, 11, 19 n. 4; *Relationi*, 20 n. 1; Alliance with Uzūn Ḥasan, 12; Peace treaty with Bāyezid, 12; Diarist, 20; Senate, 20
 Wahy, 53

Wāli, wāliya, awliyā, 1, 32, 33, 42 n. 3, 50, 53, 66, 70
 Waqfs, 38; *Waqf-nāmas*, 54 n. 4
 Warsaq (Turkmāns), 81
 Waṣīyat, 79 n. 5
 West, Western: Imperialism, 13; commerce, 14; alliances, 14–15; Rapprochement with Iran, 19; Scholars, 21; Religious activity, 22
 Wildya, 53 n. 1
 Wildyat-i 'ahd, 79 n. 5
 Wildyat-i ma'navi, 72 n. 2
 Yadd-dāshha (memoirs), 20
 Yārlıq (*fırmañ*), 53 n. 6
 Yazd (Ātabeks), 9
 Yazılıs, 55, 80 n. 10
 Zāhid, 68 n. 1
 Zāhidī (family genealogy), 51, 53 n. 1
 Zāhir, 72 n. 2
 Zāhirī, 26
 Zāidī, 3, 4, 5, 30
 Zaidiya, 5
 Zawīyā (Sūfi centers), 57 n. 3

4. AUTHORS AND WORKS

'Abd Allāh ibn Nūr ad-Dīn, 69
 'Abd al-Gālib ibn Abī l-Fadl al-Qazwīnī ar-Rāzī, 61
 Abū l-Fidā', 14, 39, 56
 Aṣdal at-tawārīḥ, 49, 50
 Aīšār, I., 20, 68
 Āgā Buzurg at-Tihrānī, 28
 'Aqd'ib al-maqdūr (of Ibn 'Arabī-Sāh), 16
 al-Aḥarī, Abu Bakr al-Quṭbī, 16, 64
 Aḥbār ad-duwal (of Qaramānī), 16, 72, 80
 Aḥlāq-i Ġalālī, 23
 Aḥlāq-i Nāṣiri, 23, 26, 27
 Ahsan at-tawārīḥ, 1, 2, 6, 17, 69, 80, 81, 82
 Aḥwāl-o-āyār (of Tūsī), 24, 27
 al-'Aīlam az-zāhir fi aḥwāl al-awā'il wal-awāḥir (of Gannābil), 16
 al-'Aīma al-ifnātāśār, 1
 al-'Aīnī, 18
 al-'Aīmā: Qāmūs tārīghim . . . , 67, 68
 Alberi, Eugenio, 20
 (*Kitāb*) al-Ālfān al-fāriq . . . , 29
 'Alī Bey, 18
 'Alī ibn Sams ad-Dīn ibn Hāggī Husain, 16, 80
 Alizadē, 21, 39
 Allegri, M., 20
 al-'Āmilī, Zain ad-Dīn, 67
 al-'Amin, Muhsin, 1, 18, 63, 64, 65
 al-'Aminī, Şadr ad-Dīn Sultan İbrāhīm, 75

al-Balrānī, Yūsuf ibn Ahmad, 68
 al-Baīdāwī, Nāsir ad-Dīn, 23, 24, 34, 36 ff., 41, 59
 Baiqarā, Husain, 54
 Bālā, Mīrzā, 45
 Bar-Hebraeus, Gregorius Abū l-Faraḡ, 38
 Barbaro, Giosafat, 19
 Barozzi, N., 20
 Barrasīhā-yi tārīḥi, 53
 Barthold, V. V., 7, 21, 64
 Bausani, A., 21, 22, 60
 Bayānī, Śīru, 53
 Beidhawī *Commentarius in Coranum*, 37
 Berchet, G., 20
 al-Bidāya wa n-Nihāya (of Ibn Kaffr), 8
 Bidīlī, Sarafhān, 24, 71
 Bihār al-anwār, 24, 32, 66, 67, 68
 Birge, J. K., 62
 Blochet, E., 61
 Bombaci, A., 66
 Bousquet, G. H., 4
 Bouvat, L., 57, 58, 60, 61
 Brockelmann, C., 1, 2
 de la Broquière, Bertrandon, 19
 Brosset, M., 65
 Browne, Edward G., 1, 2, 3, 4, 16, 21, 22, 26, 37, 38, 39, 40, 51, 55, 56, 60, 64, 65, 67, 69, 71, 74, 79
 Burn, Richard, 66
 Busse, H., 19

Buyūruq (ascribed to Şaih Şaff ad-Dīn), 50
 Cahen, Claude, 21, 61, 63
 Canard, M., 2
 Caskel, W., 21, 69, 70
 Chalcocondyles, 74
 Chardin, 19, 50
 de Clavigo, 19
 Corbin, H., 21, 80, 83
 aṣ-ṣāḥabī, Muḥammad ibn ‘Uṭmān, 28, 30
 Dāhir, Sulaimān, 26, 67
Dāniṣmandān-i Ḵabarbaġān, 50
 Dānišpažūh, Muḥammad Taqī, 24, 26
ad-Dari'a ilā taṣānīs aṣ-ṣī'a, 28
 Darrābī, 'Abd ar-Rahīm Kalāntar, 16
ad-Daw' al-Lāmi' li-ahl al-qarn at-tāsi', 18, 55, 64, 65
Daulat Bani Qalawūn fi Miṣr, 39
 Daulat-Sāh, 54
Dawāzdaḥ-i Imām (of Naṣīr ad-Dīn Tūṣī), 27
 Dawwānī, Galāl ad-Dīn, 34, 78, 84, 85
Diāri (of Sanuto), 20
 Dickson, M. B., 1, 2, 17, 21, 47, 49, 71
 Dietrich, A., 18
 Donaldson, D. M., 1
 Dorn, B., 16
Droit musulman . . . (translation of *Sārā'i' al-Islām*), 1, 28
ad-Durār al-kāmina, 18, 29, 32, 33, 62, 64, 71
 Efendiev, O. A., 5, 21
Estat de la Perse en 1660, 19
 Falsafī, Naṣīr Allāh, 2, 54, 74, 75
Farhang-i ḡuṛṣṭiyād-yi Irān, 44, 69
Farhang-i Irān-zamīn, 31
Farsnāma-yi Nāṣīrī, 31, 37, 79
 Fasā'ī, Hasan Husainī, 31, 37, 79, 80
 Faṣḥāl of Ḥwālī, 17, 22, 24, 33, 56, 62, 64, 66
Fawḍ'id ar-razawiya, 66, 68
Fawḍ'id-i Suljānīya, 29
 Faṣīl Iṣfahānī, 49
 Feridūn, Əḥməd Bey, 19, 34, 81
Fihrist Kutub aṣ-ṣī'a, 27
 Fil-roze, 21
 Firdausī, 46
 Fischel, W. J., 65
 Fischer, S. N., 19, 78
 Fleischer, H. O., 37
 Fraschery, Sami, 18
 Frye, R. N., 45
 Fulin, R., 20
 Fūmani, 'Abd al-Fattāh, 16
al-Furqān bain auliya' ar-Rahmān . . . , 42
Fusūl (of Naṣīr ad-Dīn Tūṣī), 24
Futūḥat-i Sāḥī (or *Sāmī/Yumna/Yamānī?*), 75

Gabriel, A., 19
 Gaffārī, Qāḍī Abīmad, 1, 2, 17, 64, 69, 71, 72, 80
Çahān-dārī, see *Tārīħ-i ğahān-dārī* (of Gaffārī)
 Ġāmī, 42, 53, 54
Ġāmī' al-ansāb, 48, 51, 68
Ġāmī' ad-duwāt (of Muṇaqqim-bāšī), 18, 45, 72, 80
Ġāmī' al-tawārīħ (of Raśīd ad-Dīn Faḍl Allāh), 8, 16
 Ġannābī, 16, 80
 Ġawād, Muṣṭafā, 26
 Gibb, E. J. W., 21, 54
 Gibb, H. A. R., 42, 61
 Giese, Friedrich, 18
 al-Ġiyāṭī, see al-Baġdādī, 'Abd Allāh ibn Fath Allāh
 Glassen, Erika, 1, 81
 Gökbilgin, M. T., 8
 Gölpinarlı, Abdulkabir, 56
 Goldziher, I., 7
 Gordlevskiy, 21, 61
Ġuṛṭāfiyād-yi muṣāṣṣal-i Irān, 31, 44
Gulšān-i rāz, 80
 al-Ġurğānī, as-Sayyid aš-Šarīf, 5, 84
 Guwāmī, 'Atā Malik, 8, 15
Habib as-siyar fi aḥkām asrād al-bāṣar, 1, 17, 30, 33, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 66, 69, 70, 72, 75, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82
 Ḥaṭṭī-i Abrū, 16, 17, 22, 38, 54, 66
Ḩaṭṭī-i Sirīn-suhan, 39
Ḩaṣṭ iqlīm (of Rāzī), 16, 44, 54, 71
 Halil, Mükrimin, 19
 Hammer-Purgstall, Joseph von, 39, 62
Ḩawādīt ad-duhūr, 18, 69
al-Ḩawādīt al-ġāmī'a, (of Ibn al-Fūtī), 14, 38, 42
Ḩaydāt al-Imām aṣ-Ṣāḥīd al-awwāl, 27, 67
 Hidāyat, Riḍā Quṭb-hān, 17, 18, 54
 Hikmat, 'All Asḡar, 18
 al-Hillī, Ga'far ibn al-Ḥasan, 1, 28
 al-Hillī, Şaff ad-Dīn, 64
 Hinz, W., 14, 21, 55, 69
 Ḥirātī, Faḍrlī, 18
(Kitāb) al-Ḥiṭāf (of Maqrīzī), 5, 18
 Hitti, P. K., 4
 Hodgson, M. G. S., 4, 5
 Horst, H., 51, 54, 55
 Howorth, H. H., 39
 Huart, C., 4
Hudūd al-'dālām, 44, 45
 Ḥunġī, Faḍl Allāh ibn Rūzbihān, 17, 27 fl., 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 38, 49, 52, 65, 70, 72, 73, 74, 75 fl.
 al-Hurr al-Āmilī, 71
 al-Husainī, Abū l-Faṭḥ, 47
 Husainī, Ga'far ibn Muham-mad, 68
Husn al-muḥādara, 18
 Ḥwāndamīr, Ġiyāṭ ad-Dīn, 1, 16, 30, 33, 51, 52, 54, 55, 66, 69, 70, 72, 75, 78, 80, 82
 Ḥwānsārī, Muḥammad Bāqir, 24, 28, 29, 31, 32, 37, 60, 64, 67, 68, 85
(Kitāb) al-‘Ibar . . . (i. e., Ibn Ḥaldūn's *Tārīħ*), 32, 56
Ibṭil nahq al-bāṭil . . . , 32 fl.
 Ibn al-Āṭir, 'Izz ad-Dīn, 1, 2, 15, 65
 Ibn al-Fūtī, 14, 38, 42
 Ibn al-Muṭahhar al-Hillī, al-Ḥa-san ibn Yūsuf, 6, 23, 24, 27 fl., 34, 35, 37, 41, 59, 71
 Ibn aš-Šīħā, Muḥammad, 65
 Ibn al-Wardī, 56
 Ibn 'Arab-ṣāh, Abīmad ibn Mu-hammād, 16
 Ibn Bābawāih, 27, 71
 Ibn Baṭṭūṭa, 2, 19, 32, 33, 36, 39, 41, 60, 62, 64, 66, 69
 Ibn Bazzāz, Tawakkulī ibn Is-mā'īl ibn Ḥāggī al-Ardabīllī, 45, 47, 48, 50, 51
 Ibn Fahd al-Hillī, Abīmad, 67 fl., 71
 Ibn Falāḥ, Muḥammad, 67 fl., 69
 Ibn ḥaġār al-Asqalānī, 18, 29, 32, 33, 34, 55, 62, 64, 71
 Ibn Ḥaldūn, 5, 15, 32, 42, 56, 65
 Ibn ḥallikān, 62
 Ibn ḥazm, 5
 Ibn İyās, 18, 69, 81
 Ibn Kaṭīr, Ismā'īl ibn 'Umar, 7
 Ibn Makki al-Āmilī, Muham-mad, 27, 66 fl., 71
 Ibn Šadqam, 68
 Ibn Tagrī-birdī, 8, 18, 64, 69
 Ibn Taimīya, 23, 24, 27 fl., 34, 35, 36, 38, 41, 42, 59
 Ibn Ṭulūn, Sams ad-Dīn Mu-hammād, 1
 al-İglī, 'Aqdūd ad-Dīn, 5, 23, 84
İhqāq al-ḥaqqa, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 37, 55
(Kitāb) al-I'lam . . . (of Nahra-wālī), 72, 80
Inbā' al-ġumr bi-abnā' al-'umr, 55
 Iqbāl, 'Abbās, 9, 20, 26, 54, 57, 67
'Iqd al-ġumān, 18
 Iqtidārī, Abīmad, 31
 İsfazārī, Mu'īn ad-Dīn, 17, 66
al-İstibṣār, 27
 Ivanov, Vladimir A., 2, 4, 26, 40, 50
 Jorga, N., 63
 Juynboll, Th. W., 1, 41
al-Kāfi, 27
 Kaḥḥāla, 'Umar Riḍā, 67, 68
 Kaihān, Maṣ'ūd, 31, 44, 69
Kālām al-Mādī, 69, 70
al-Kāmil (of Ibn al-Āṭir), 1, 2, 15, 65

Kanturi, I'gaz Husain, 24, 28, 50, 69
 Karamzin, 11
 al-Kasani, Abū l-Qāsim 'Abd Allāh ibn 'Allī, 16
Kaṣf al-ḥuqūb wal-astār . . . , 28, 50, 69
Kaṣf al-murād fi ḥarīq taqrīd al-iṣqād, 24
 Kasrawi, Ahmad, 20, 47, 48, 50, 55, 69, 70
 al-Kazimi, Muhammad Mahdi, 30
 Kissling, H. J., 58, 62
 Köprülü, M. F., 20, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 79
 al-Kulaini, 27, 71
Kulliyat-i Qāsim-i Anwār, 54
Kulliyat-i Sams-i Tabrizi, 59
 Kutubi, Maḥmūd, 16

Lâhiğî, Sams ad-Din Muhammad, 80
 Lane-Poole, S., 63, 79
 Laouest, Henri, 26, 28
Lafḍ'is al-haqiq, 39
Lawd'ih (of Gāmi), 42
 Le Strange, G., 44, 46, 69
 Lech, Klaus, 29, 38, 43, 56
 Levy, R., 18, 19
 Lewis, Bernard, 3, 4, 5, 25, 40, 62
Literary History of Persia (E. G. Browne), 1, 2, 3, 4, 21, 37, 38, 39, 40, 53, 55, 64, 65, 67, 69, 71, 74, 79
 Lockhart, L., 21, 71
Lubb at-tawâriħ, 1, 69, 72, 80, 81, 83
 Lugal, Necati, 2, 17
Lu'u'at al-Bahrain, 68
al-Lum'a ad-Dimashqiya, 67
Luristân-i Kuhan . . . , 31

Mafâlîh al-i'gâz fi Ṣârî Gulšân-i râz, 80
Mağâlis al-mu'minîn, 22, 27, 32, 53, 54, 60, 64, 65, 66, 68, 69, 80
Mağâlis al-'us̄aq, 54
Mağâlis an-nâfi', 18
Mağalla-yi Dânişkada-yi Adabi-yât (Tehran University), 26, 83
Mağallat al-Mağma' al-'Ilmî al-'Arabî (Damascus), 26, 67
 Mağdîl, Muhammed al-Husainî al-Hâ'iři, 72
 Mağîlîs, Muhammed Bâqîr, 24, 32, 66, 67, 68, 71
Mağma' al-fusâħâ, 18, 54
Mağma' al-tawâriħ (of Hâfiż-i Abrû), 22, 38
Mağmû' ar-rasâ'il (of Ibn Taimiya), 35
Mağmû'a-yi rasâ'il wa-as'âr-i Aħl-i Haqq, 50
 al-Mâmaqâni, 'Abd Allâh ibn Muhammed, 66, 68
Man lâ yahduruhu al-saqîh, 27
al-Manhal as-sâfi, 18, 64
 du Mans, Raphael, 19

Maqâm-i Irân dar târiħ-i İslâm, 44
Maqâmât wa-maqâdît (ascribed to Saīh Ṣâliḥ ad-Dîn Ardatbîl), 49, 50
 al-Maqrizî, Ahmâd ibn 'All, 5, 7, 18, 39
 al-Marâzi, Zâhir ad-Dîn ibn Nasîr ad-Dîn, 16
 Margoliouth, D. S., 37, 44
Mâslîh al-abṣâr, 19, 29, 38, 43, 56
 Massé, H., 53, 64
 al-Mas'ûdî, 16
Mâṣṭâ' as-Sâ'dâin (of Samarqandî), 16, 17, 57, 80
Mâṣṭâ'yi ma'nâwi, 59, 60
al-Mawâqîf fi 'Ilm al-Kâlâm, 5
 Ménage, V., 13
 Menzel, Th., 55
Mihmânnâma-yi Buhârâ, 31
 Miller, W., 74
 Miklukho-Maklay, 21
Minhâj al-i'stidâr . . . (of Ibn Tâimîya), 28, 29
Minhâj al-kardâma fi ma'rîfat al-imâma, 28, 29, 34
Minhâj aš-Šâfi'i . . . , 30
 Minorsky, Vladimir F., 2, 7, 14, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 24, 38, 41, 43, 44, 45, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 54 ff., 63 ff., 69 ff., 73 ff., 78, 80
 Minovi, Muğtabâ, 38
Mir'âl al-ġîdâن . . . , 37
Mîrhând, 17, 24, 33, 66
 Molé, M., 21
 Mordtmann, J., 13
 Moscati, S., 4
Mu'gam al-bulâdân (of Yâqût), 44, 45
Mu'gam al-mu'allîfîn, 67, 68
Mugmal-i Faṣîḥî, 17, 33, 56, 62, 64, 66
Mugâl Irân bain al-Mâslîhiya wal-Islâm, 22
 Muhsin-i Fâid, Mullâ, 71
Muhtasar ad-dâwîl (of Bar-Hebraeus), 38
al-Muhtasar an-nâfi' fi siqh al-imâmiya, 1, 28
(Kitâb) al-Muhtasar fi abbâr al-bâsîr (of Abû l-Fidâ'), 14, 39, 56
 Mu'in, Muhammed, 39
Muhâdâbî-i Raśîd (of Raśîd ad-Dîn), 16, 23, 27, 53
 al-Munaqqid, Salâh ad-Dîn, 1, 15
 Munaqqim-bâsi, Ahmâd ibn Lutî Allâh, 18, 45, 65, 72, 80
Munâṣṣib-i Hâdîqâ Sîhâb ad-Dîn 'Abd Allâh Maruârid, 19
Munâṣṣib-i Hâdîs Ev-ogli, 19
Munâṣṣib-i Salâdîn, 19, 34, 81
 Munîb, Iskandar Beg, 1, 16, 17, 47, 54, 55, 56, 69, 72, 74, 75, 78, 80, 81
al-Muntaqâ min Minhâj al-i'stidâr, 28, 29, 30
al-Muqaddîma (of Ibn Haldûn), 5, 15

Murtâzâwi, Manûčehr, 16, 22, 38
 Muṣaffâ, M., 18
 Mušâb, Hânbâbâ, 20
Muṣâ'fa'yâdîn . . . , 69, 70

Nâṣîħât al-uns . . . , 42, 53
 Naftâlî, Sa'îd, 54
Nâhî al-hâqq, 28, 30 ff.
 an-Nâhrâwâlî, Muhammed ibn Ahmâd, 72, 80
Nâma-yi Dânişkada-yi Nâşîrî, 24, 36, 64, 68
(Kitâb) an-Naqâd, 61
A Narrative of Italian Travels in Persia in the 15th and 16th Centuries, 19
Naşîrîya-yi Dânişkada-yi Adabi-yât (Tabriz University), 22, 38
 Nawâ'î, 'Abd al-Husain, 19
 Nawâ'î, Mir 'Ali-Şîr, 18
 Nedim Ahmed Efendi, 18
 Nicholson, R. A., 20, 60
 Nikitin, Afanasy, 19
 Nikitine, B., 45, 47, 52, 53, 57
Nîzâm at-tawâriħ (of Baiqâwî), 37
 Nöldeke, Th., 37
an-Nugâm as-zâhîra, 18
Nushâb al-Qulâb (of Qazwînî), 16, 46, 69

d'Ohsson, C. M., 39
Osmâni Târihi, 63

Papazyan, 21
 Parry, V. J., 78
 Parwizî, Sams ad-Dîn, 50
 Pegolotti, Fr. B., 43
Persia in A. D. 1478-1490 (Hun-î/Minorsky), 2, 31 (see also *Târiħ-i 'âlam-ârâ-yi Amînî*)
 Petrushevsky, I. P., 19, 21, 67
 Poliak, A. N., 69
 Polo, Marco, 19, 43, 44, 45
 Popper, W., 8, 14
La Pratica della Mercatura, 43

Qâ'immaqâmi, Ğâhangîr, 53
 al-Qâlaşandî, Ahmâd ibn 'All, 5, 40, 56
Qârd-mâgmû'a (or *Kardgâmea*, ascribed to Saīh Ṣâliḥ ad-Dîn), 50
 Qaramâni, Ahmâd ibn Yûsuf, 16, 72, 80
Qâwâ'id al-âhkâm, 28
Qâwâ'id al-Islâm (of Ibn al-Mutâħħar), 6, 28
 Qazwînî, Hâkim Sâh Muhammed, 18
 Qazwînî Hamd Allâh Mustaufî, 16, 46, 69
 Qazwînî, Muhammed, 20, 42, 47, 48, 53, 64
 Qazwînî, Yahyâ ibn 'Abd al-Laħî, 1, 69, 72, 80, 81, 83
Qîṣâs al-wâimâ, 27, 28, 32, 67, 69
 Querry, A., 1, 28
 Qumî, Qâdi Ahmâd, 1
 Qumî, 'Abbâs, 66, 68

Qummi, Hasan ibn Muham-mad, 16

Raṣīd ad-Dīn Faḍl Allāh, 8, 15, 16, 18, 23, 27, 29, 39, 53

ar-Rauḍa al-bahiya bi-ṣarḥ al-Lum'a, 67

Rauḍat al-Gannat (of Ḥwānsārī), 24, 27, 29, 31, 32, 37, 60, 64, 68, 85

Rauḍat al-Gannat (of Isfazarī), 17, 66

Raudat al-mandżir, 65

Raudat as-Safā (of Mīrhwāndī), 17, 24, 33, 66

Rauḍat at-taslim, see *Taṣawwurātī*

Rauḍati, Muḥammad 'Allī, 48, 51, 68

Razawi, Muḥammad Taqī Mu-darris, 24, 27

Rāzī, Ahmad Amin, 16, 44, 54, 71

R. lationi degli ambasciatori Veneti al Senato, 20

Reynsner, 21

Riħla (of Ibn Battūta), see *Tuhfat an-nużahr*

Risāla fi waħdat al-waqfūd, 42

Risāla-yi İmāmat, 24, 25, 27

Ritter, H., 60

Roemer, Hans R., 1, 17, 18, 21, 55

Rosenthal, Franz, 4

Ross, E. Denison, 54, 60

Rūmī, Gałāl ad-Dīn, 59 ff.

Rūmlū, Hasan, 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 16, 17, 54, 69, 80, 81, 82

as-Šabak: min firaq al-gulāt . . . , 50, 52

Sabistari, 80

Sābitiyān, D., 19

Sābiti, Muhaminad, 18

Safwat al-anbiyā' fl-dikr kard-mi al-aqđāb (ascribed to Saīf Saīf ad-Dīn), 50

Safwat as-Ṣafā, 45, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 55, 57

Sāggādīya, Gāwād, 38

Sāħħif al-akhbar, 18, 65

as-Sāħħawī, 18, 55, 64, 65

Sāħħadma (of Firdausī), 46

as-Sāhrastānī, 5

Saīf Saīf wa labdaš, 47, 48

Salmān-i Sāwāfi, 16

Sāmī, Niżām ad-Dīn, 16, 65

Samarqandi, Kamāl ad-Dīn 'Abd ar-Razzāq, 16, 17, 54, 57, 80

Sāmī, Nizām ad-Dīn, 16, 65

Samu ad-Dīn, Muḥammad Riḍā, 27, 67

Sanuto, Marino, the Younger, 20

as-Saqd'iq an-Nu'māniya, 62

Sārafñāma, 24, 71

(Kitāb) **Sard'i al-Islām**, 1, 28

as-Sārtāfī, Ahmad Ḥāmid, 50, 52

Sarwar, Gūlam, 20

Sauvaire, H., 55

Savory, R. M., 10, 64

Sayar, I. M., 61

Scheffer, C., 19

Schiltberger, J., 19, 44

Schmidt-Dumont, M., 17

Seddon, Ch. N., 2, 17

Shakhmaliev, 21

Sīfa as-Sā'il . . ., 42

Silsilat an-nasab-i Ṣafawīya, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 72

Siouffi, N., 32

Siyar as-Ṣūfīya (ascribed to Saīf Saīf ad-Dīn), 50

Sm th, J. M., 64

Spuler, B., 21, 29, 43

Stefani, F., 20

Storey, Ch. A., 2, 16

Strothmann, R., 4, 26, 41

Şubh al-a'sā, 5, 40, 56

Subki, Tāg ad-Dīn, 32, 36

as-Ṣāfiyya wa l-fuqādī, 42

Sūlūk al-mulūk (of Ḥungī), 31

as-Sulūk li-ma'rifa dhuwal al-mulūk (of Maqrīzī), 18, 39

Sūmer, Faruk, 2, 17, 69

Surūr, Muḥammad Čamāl ad-Dīn, 39

Sūstarī, Qādi Nūr Allāh, 27 ff., 30 ff., 37, 53 ff., 60, 64, 65 ff., 68, 69, 80

as-Suyūṭī, 18

Tabaqat as-Ṣāfiyya, 32, 36

Tabrizī, Ahmad ibn Karīm, 47

Taqhirat al-Mulūk (abbreviated as T. M.), 49, 54, 70

Taqhīra-yi Sāmī, see *Tuhfa-yi Sāmī*

Taqhīra-yi Sāmī, 69

(Kitāb) **Taqhirat al-a'liyā'**, 50

Taeschner, F., 8, 13, 18

Taftazānī, Sa'd ad-Dīn, 34, 42, 84

Taqrid al-aqđā'id (or al-kalām), 24

at-Tahāwī, Abū Ča'far Ahmad, 36

Tahđib al-akhām, 27

Tahđiq dar bīra-yi Ilħanān-i Irān, 22

Takmilat al-abbādī, 5

Tanqīħ al-maqādī (of Māmaqānī), 66, 68

Tarbiyat, Muḥammad 'Allī, 50

at-Ta'rif bi-l-muṣṭalaħ as-Šarīf, 56

at-Ta'rif bi-Ibn Haldūn wa-riħ-laħi . . ., 65

(Kitāb) **at-Ta'rifat**, 5

Tārīħ (of Ibn Haldūn), see (Kitāb) **al-'Ibar**

at-Tārīħ al-Ğiyāħi (of al-Bagħdādī), 17, 20, 37, 65, 69

Tārīħ al-hulaħa', (of as-Suyūṭī), 18

Tārīħ al-'Irāq bain Iħsildiain, 2, 16, 20, 27, 32, 38, 39, 44, 45, 68, 69, 70

Tārīħ al-Yasidīya, 55

Tārīħ-i 'Alam-ārđ-yi 'Abħbaši (of Munif), 1, 16, 17, 47, 54, 55, 56, 69, 72, 74, 75, 78, 80, 81

Tārīħ-i 'Alam-ārđ-yi Amīni (of Ḥungī), 17, 32, 49, 65, 69, 70, 73 ff.

Tārīħ-i Āl-i Ġaldyir, 53

Tārīħ-i Āl-i Muṣaffar (of Kutubī), 16

Tārīħ-i Diydrbakriya, 2, 17, 31, 69

Tārīħ-i Ga'farī, 68

Tārīħ-i ġaħān-ārđ (of Gaħarf), 1, 2, 17, 64, 69, 71, 72, 80

Tārīħ-i ġaħān-gušša (of Guwai-ni), 8, 15

Tārīħ-i Ġilān (of Fūmani), 16

Tārīħ-i Guġġafīya-yi Huzīstān, (of Sūstarī), 69

Tārīħ-i guzida (of Qazwīnī), 16, 46

Tārīħ-i Ḥāni (of 'All ibn Šams ad-Dīn ibn ḥaggī Husain), 16, 80

Tārīħ-i Husāmī, 68

Tārīħ-i muṣaċċal-i Irān, 9, 20, 26, 54, 57, 67

Tārīħ-i pañċad sħalla-yi Huzīstān, 69

(Kitāb) **Tārīħ-i Qumm** (of Qum-mi), 16

Tārīħ-i Saīħ Uwais (of al-Aha-ri), 16, 64

Tārīħ-i Tabāristān wa-Rāyān wa-Mazandarān (of al-Mar'a-ti), 16

Tārīħ-i Ulqāitu (of Kāšānī), 16

Tārīħ-i Waṣṣaf, 39

Tasawwurātī (of Naṣr ad-Dīn Tūsi), 2

at-Taṣayyu' wa l-Šī'a, 69

Taškōprū-zuđé, Ahmad, 62

Tauer, F., 17

Tavernier, 19

Tawārīħ-i Āl-i Osmān, 18, 74

Tevfik, Rizā, 61

at-Tibr al-masbūk, 18

Tihrānī, Abū Bakr, 2, 69

Togan, Z. V., 11, 16, 18, 29, 47, 48, 50, 55, 59, 77

Tornberg, C. J., 2

Toynbee, A., 15

Travels to Tana and Persia, 19

Tschudi, R., 62

Tuhfa-yi Sāmī, 54, 80

Tuhfa al-adib (of Čannābī), 16, 80

Tuhfa al-azħħar, 68

Tuhfa an-nużahr . . . (Ibn Bat-tūta's *Riħla*)

2, 19, 32, 33, 36, 39, 41, 60, 62, 64, 66, 69

at-Tunakabunī, Muḥammad, 27, 28, 32, 67, 69

Türk edebiyatında ilh mutasav-viſlar, 57, 58

Turkmenshaya Iskra (newspaper, Ashkabad, U. S. S. R.), 4

at-Tūsi, Muḥammad ibn al-Ha-sān ("Saīħ at-Tā'īfa"), 27, 71

at-Tūsi, Naṣr ad-Dīn, 2, 23, 24 ff., 37, 41, 42, 59

Tyan, E., 46

al-'Ulaimi, Muğīr ad-Dīn, 34, 55

al-'Umarī, Ibn Faḍl Allāh, 19,
29, 38, 43, 56
al-chnitt al-ṭarīb al-Quds
wal-Hallī, 54, 55
Uzunçarşılı, İ. H., 63

della Valle, Pietro, 19
Van Loon, J. B., 16

Wafayat al-a'yān, 62
Walsh, J. R., 61
Wansbrough, J., 11
Wassaf, 'Abd Allāh ibn Faḍl
Allāh, 39

Wazīrī-yi Kirmānī, Aḥmad 'Alī
Hān, 16
Wittek, P., 8, 58, 62, 76
Woods, J. E., 17

Yaddigār, 48, 53, 64
Yādnāma-yi Ḥwāġa Naṣīr ad-
Dīn Tūslī, 27
al-Yāfi'i, 'Abd Allāh ibn As'ad,
37
Yalıtkaya, M. Ş., 63
Yāqūt, 16, 44, 45, 69
Yāsimī, Raḍīd, 44
Yazdī, Saraf ad-Dīn 'Alī, 16
Yunus Emre: *Hayati*, 56

Żafarnāma (of Ḥamd Allāh
Mustauṣ Qazwīnī), 46
Żafarnāma (of Yazdī), 16, 65
Zāhidī, Saīd Husain ibn Abdāl,
51, 54, 55, 56, 72
Zandigānī-yi Sāh 'Abbās-i Aw-
wāl, 2, 54, 74, 75
Zaryāb, 'Abbās, 68
Zīg-i İlbānī, 23
Zinat al-maġālis, 72
Ziriklī, Ḥair ad-Dīn, 67, 68
Ziyāda, M., 15, 18
Zubdat al-tawāriḥ (of Ḥāfiẓ-i
Abru), 16, 17
az-Zu'bī, Muḥammad 'Alī, 4

FREIBURGER ISLAMSTUDIEN

Herausgegeben von Hans Robert Roemer

Band I

Barbara von Palombini

Bündniswerben abendländischer Mächte um Persien 1453-1600

1968. VIII, 138 Seiten, brosch. DM 30,—

Die wichtigste Rolle, die das schi'itische Persien nach dem Fall von Konstantinopel als Bündnispartner der europäischen Staaten in den Auseinandersetzungen mit dem Osmanischen Reich spielte, wird in diesem Buch eingehend dargestellt.

Band II

Donald P. Little

An Introduction to Mamluk Historiography

An Analysis of Arabic Annalistic and Bibliographical Sources for the Reign of al-Malik an-Nâṣir Muḥammad ibn Qalâ'ün.

1970. X, 154 Seiten, brosch. DM 32,—

Eine exakte Textanalyse der Quellen für die Regierungszeit des 6. bahritischen Mamlukensultans gibt Einblicke in die Methoden der Geschichtsschreibung nicht nur der Zeit der Bahriten (1254-1382), sondern der zeitgenössischen muslimischen Historiographie überhaupt.

Band III

Michel M. Mazzaoui

The Origins of the Ṣafawids: Šī'ism, Sūfism, and the Ġulāt

1972. X, 109 Seiten, brosch. DM 28,—

Die Arbeit behandelt die Geschichte Irans und der benachbarten Gebiete seit der Eroberung von Bagdad durch die Mongolen 1258 bis zum Aufstieg der Safawiden 1501 unter Berücksichtigung der religiösen und sozialen Gegebenheiten.

Band IV

Udo Steinbach

Dāt al-Himma

Kulturgeschichtliche Untersuchungen zu einem arabischen Volksroman.

1972. X, 151 Seiten, brosch. DM 46,—

Der Verfasser weist nach, daß die arabischen Volksromane in keiner Hinsicht individuelle Schöpfungen sind, sondern daß der Inhalt der Handlung und die Form der die Handlung vorantreibenden Helden stets verbindlichen gesellschaftlichen Normen entsprechen.

FRANZ STEINER VERLAG GMBH · WIESBADEN